

DATE ISSUED: February 11, 2004

REPORT NO. PC-04-042

ATTENTION: Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Balboa Park Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study

OWNER: City of San Diego

APPLICANT: City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department

SUMMARY

This Report is a response to the Planning Commission Workshop comments on November 6, 2003, and is provided in preparation for the February 19, 2004 Planning Commission Workshop.

BACKGROUND

In June of 2002, the City Park and Recreation Department received funding to conduct a study to evaluate long-term needs for the Central Mesa and Inspiration Point areas of Balboa Park. The Study was initiated due to continuing issues relating to land use, circulation and parking.

This Study is not intended to replace the adopted 1989 Master Plan or subsequent Precise Plans. In fact, much of the information contained within the Study reaffirms the policies and recommendations of these documents. This has been confirmed through an extensive community outreach program as described in the attached report.

In the November 6th workshop with the Planning Commission, the Commissioners commented that many of the recommendations of the adopted Master Plan and Precise Plans have not been implemented. In the fifteen years since the adoption of the Master Plan, the context for the Park, city and region has evolved. Current Park issues must be evaluated with respect to both the guidance provided in the Master Plan and with awareness of changing needs and impacts over time, both within and surrounding the Park. Recognizing the rich history of the Park, the goals of the adopted Master Plan, and the current circumstances, our goal is simple; how do we make changes that will improve the Park and provide a good Park experience?

On November 6th, 2003, Park and Recreation staff and the consultant team held a workshop with the Planning Commission to solicit input on the status of the Study. The Commissioners provided many thoughtful comments, and posed several very relevant questions. We have taken those comments and questions seriously and have made modifications to the Study and recommendations accordingly. Modifications have also been made as a result of a series of workshops with the Balboa Park Committee, which is the officially recognized Planning Group for Balboa Park.

The Balboa Park Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study is still a work in progress. The attached staff report and the upcoming February 19th workshop represent the most current evolution of the Study, and the current thoughts on how to address Park issues. The Study makes recommendations that, in some instances, differ from the Master Plan but are complementary to the goals of the Master Plan. Once the Study is complete and the Balboa Park Committee takes action on it, the Study will be referred to the Design Review Committee of the Park and Recreation Board and then to the Park and Recreation Board for action prior to returning to the Planning Commission for appropriate review.

The attached report is intended to provide additional background information to address the comments and questions posed by the Planning Commission. Many of the issues are included in the body of the report. More specific responses are included in Appendix A. We hope you find this report informative and helpful. Please feel free to contact me at (619) 236-6643 or Project Manager Charles Daniels at (619) 533-6597 if you require clarification or additional information.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Oppenheim
Park and Recreation Director

EO/cd

Attachment(s): Staff Report and appendices

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS
NOVEMBER 6, 2003 PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP
BALBOA PARK LAND USE, CIRCULATION AND PARKING STUDY**

I. OVERVIEW

II. SUMMARY OF THE HISTORY OF THE STUDY

- A. Balboa Park Master Plan**
- B. Community Plans**
- C. Adjacent Studies and Projects**
- D. Why Update?**

III STUDY OUTLINE

- A. Phase I: Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study**
- B. Phase II: Plan Amendment/Update**
- C. Phase III: Implementation**

IV PUBLIC PROCESS

V STAGES OF THE STUDY

- A. Stage 1: Discovery Stage**
- B. Stage 2: Findings and Options Stage**
- C. Stage 3: Preliminary Draft Plan Stage**
- D. Stage 4: Draft Plan Stage**
- E. Stage 5: Final Draft Plan Stage**

VI SUMMARY

APPENDICES

- A. Specific Planning Commission Comments and Responses**
- B. Discovery White Paper**
- C. Park Acreage Statistics for Surrounding Communities**
- D. Options A, B and C from Findings and Options Stage**
- E. Current Study Plans: Land Use, Circulation, Parking and Illustrative Plan, Phasing Plans**
- F. Parking Quantities Analysis**
- G. Stakeholder Interview List**
- H. Consultant Selection Memorandum**

I OVERVIEW

The Context

At just under 1200 acres, Balboa Park is one of the nation's largest urban parks. As home to numerous recreational, educational and cultural institutions and organizations, it is also one of the nation's most diverse and unique parks. This combination of park, gardens and institutions is unparalleled in the nation. This mix of park, gardens and cultural amenities is Balboa Park's strength, and its challenge. At over 135 years in age, Balboa Park is a mature park. Its many layers and uses have begun to overlap to a point of congestion. Land use, circulation and parking all exhibit conflicts both internally and externally, raising issues within the Park's boundaries, and on the Park's boundary with the surrounding urban fabric.

The Analysis

The issues of land use, circulation and parking within Balboa Park give rise to a series of key conclusions. These conclusions are the base for specific action recommendations contained in the report.

- Congestion in the core of the Central Mesa will only increase unless parking is relocated and consolidated
- Parking must be relocated to allow better management of multiple uses
- Parking must be relocated to reclaim parkland; structured parking below or above ground is necessary to allow a net increase in parkland
- There is a maximum amount of parking the Park can support without compromising Park integrity as a whole

The Framework

Relieving the Park's congestion requires a unified vision that will address immediate issues, while offering a long-term framework that will carry the Park to a sustainable future. The following five principles have been formulated to encapsulate this vision, and will function as the standard against which all recommendations and future decisions are measured:

- Reclaim, restore and conserve parkland
- Promote health of cultural institutions and other park elements
- Implement parking management and appropriate parking
- Implement shuttle and transit
- Distribute costs and benefits fairly

The Recommendations

The Study's key recommendations begin with relocating parking and reclaiming core parkland. Additional recommendations build outward from this reclamation into enhancing the pedestrian realm and improving internal and external connectivity.

- Manage parking to make spaces available for visitors
- Establish shuttles to link parking and destinations
- Relocate parking and access to perimeter of core areas
- Reclaim existing parking lots to restore as parkland

II SUMMARY OF THE HISTORY OF THE STUDY

A. MASTER PLAN HISTORY

Balboa Park Master Plan

In 1868, the City Trustees of San Diego set aside 1,400 acres of land for City Park (Balboa Park). Due to lack of funding and an adequate water supply, early planning and development of the Park was limited.

The first master plan for City Park was prepared by Samuel Parsons in 1903. The Park was designed in the English romantic style with meandering pathways.

The next major design effort for City Park was for the 1915 Panama California Exposition. The plans for the exposition dramatically transformed the Central Mesa of the Park from the picturesque vision of Samuel Parsons into the fair grounds for the Exposition. The buildings for the Exposition were intended to be temporary, and were to be removed at the conclusion of the event. However, due to community sentiment, the buildings were retained. It was at this time that the Park was renamed to Balboa Park.

In 1918, the first appropriation of land to the U.S. Navy occurred for the World War I effort. In 1921, the Navy constructed the first hospital.

The second master plan for Balboa Park was prepared by John Nolen in 1927. The master plan focused on the northeast quadrant of the Park and incorporated the Morley Field sports complex. Improvements including a municipal pool, bathhouse, tennis courts, golf courses and bowling greens were implemented with the issuance of a bond and Works Progress Administration funds.

In 1935, the Park hosted its second major exposition, the California Pacific International Exposition. The exposition added several new structures to the Palisades area and to the area north of El Prado. Some buildings were removed and some were added to the El Prado area.

The U.S. Navy occupied the Park from 1941 to 1947, and hospital use expanded throughout the Central Mesa.

The Cabrillo Freeway was constructed through the Park in 1949, extracting 40 acres of land.

The third master plan for Balboa Park was prepared in 1958 by the firm of Harland Bartholomew and Associates. This plan remained in effect until the update in 1989 by Estrada Land Planning, Inc.

Currently, development in Balboa Park is governed by the Balboa Park Master Plan (1989), the Central Mesa Precise Plan (1992) and the East Mesa Precise Plan (1993). The Inspiration Point Precise Plan (1998) has not been adopted by City Council.

The 1989 Balboa Park Master Plan was prepared as an update to the 1960 Master Plan prepared by Harland Bartholomew and Associates. The Master Plan was updated in 1989 to reflect changing cultural values, physical conditions, economics and political attitudes.

The Balboa Park Master Plan states that *“Since the Bartholomew Plan was completed, San Diego has grown from a city with a population of 573,000 to a city of 1,100,000 persons. As the city has grown, greater emphasis has been placed on cultural and recreational activities. The role of Balboa Park as the cultural and recreational center of the city has thus become more important to the city”*. The Study has shown that this statement still holds true today. The current population of the city of San Diego is 1,125,000, and is expected to reach 1,690,000 by the year 2020. It is anticipated that the role of Balboa Park as the cultural and recreational center of the city will continue to grow into the future. As tourism increases in San Diego, Balboa Park will become increasingly popular as a tourist destination.

Goals of the Adopted Master Plan

The goals as listed in the adopted Balboa Park Master Plan are as follows:

- Create within the Park a more pedestrian oriented environment. Reduce automobile and pedestrian conflicts. Minimize through traffic.
- Improve public access to the Park through an improved integrated circulation system, convenient drop-off points, better parking management, improved signage and increased security. The improved circulation system shall de-emphasize the automobile while increasing public access to the Park and Park facilities.
- Preserve, enhance and increase free and open parkland and establish a program of ongoing landscape design, maintenance and replacement.
- Restore or improve existing building and landscaped areas within the Park.
- Preserve and enhance the mix of cultural, and active and passive recreational uses within Balboa Park that serve national, regional community and neighborhood populations.
- Preserve Balboa Park as an affordable park experience for all citizens of San Diego.

The goals of the Master Plan are still valid, and are a part of the foundation of the Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study.

Precise Plans

Balboa Park encompasses approximately 1,172 acres, excluding freeways, roadways and past land extractions (schools, Navy Hospital, etc.). Some areas, such as the West Mesa, are relatively simple landscapes with open turf, pathways and some minor structures. Other areas of the Park, such as El Prado, the Palisades area, inspiration Point and the East Mesa, are more complex and require analysis to a greater level of detail. The Balboa Park Master Plan calls for

preparation of Precise Plans for various sub-areas of Balboa Park. The purpose of the Precise Plans is to “*guide the nature and extent of future projects for the following areas*”. The sub-areas identified for additional study are identified below, and have been addressed in the various Precise Plans.

Central Mesa Precise Plan

- The Prado
- The Palisades
- The Zoo parking lot

East Mesa Precise Plan

- The Central Operations Station (20th and B Street)
- The Arizona Landfill
- The East Mesa area

Inspiration Point Precise Plan

- The Inspiration Point area

The Central Mesa Precise Plan addresses the Prado, the Palisades, the Zoo parking lot and all remaining areas of the Central Mesa. The East Mesa Precise Plan addresses the Arizona Landfill, the Central Operations Station and the remaining areas of the East Mesa. A Precise Plan has been prepared for the Inspiration Point area, but has not been adopted by City Council.

B. SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES PLANS

Balboa Park is identified as a planning area in the City’s General Plan, and has the Balboa Park Master Plan, the Central Mesa Precise Plan and the East Mesa Precise Plan as its official planning documents. Balboa Park is surrounded by the communities of Greater North Park to the northeast, Greater Golden Hill to the southeast, Uptown to the northwest and Centre City to the southwest. Each of these communities has a community plan that addresses development in their respective areas.

The surrounding communities of North Park, Golden Hill, Uptown and Centre City are among the oldest and most established in the City of San Diego. Standards for development of population-based parks were developed in the 1980’s as a part of a nation-wide effort, and were adopted into the City’s General Plan as a guideline for new communities. However, in urbanized communities, this measure is considered a goal “if possible.” Please see Appendix C for current information regarding park standards in the adjacent communities. The communities surrounding Balboa Park turn to the Park to meet these needs on many levels. The community plans for these neighborhoods acknowledge Balboa Park as a neighborhood, community and regional asset, and provide general statements that call for providing or improving access to the Park. The community plans do not provide specific direction for how to achieve these goals.

The Centre City community contains one community park, four neighborhood parks and one joint use field. The acreage on these parks is small by comparison to other communities, with a total useable acreage of 4.66 acres. According to the SANDAG 2002 population statistics, the

Centre City community has a deficit of 45.06 acres. By the year 2020, that deficit will increase to 141.04 acres if no new parks are built. Direct access from the Centre City community is hindered by Interstate 5. Major access to the park is from 6th Avenue (through the Uptown community), State Route 163, Park Boulevard and Pershing Drive (through the Golden Hill community).

Please see Appendix C for park acreage statistics for the communities noted above.

C. ADJACENT STUDIES AND PROJECTS

The Transit First program sponsored by SANDAG will provide for bus rapid transit (BRT) along Park Boulevard through Balboa Park. The consultant team has been working with SANDAG with regard to the bus route and station locations. The Circulation Plan and the Illustrative Site Plan indicate the proposed BRT route on Park Boulevard with BRT stations in the vicinity of El Prado/Zoo entrance and at Presidents Way. The plans indicate future BRT lines on 4th Avenue and 5th Avenue with a shared BRT station on Laurel Street per discussions with SANDAG. Additionally, the consultant team is recommending a BRT line on 6th Avenue with a BRT station at Laurel Street to bring visitors closer to the Park. SANDAG anticipates that, with the assistance of the BRT, visitation to the Park via public transit will increase from five percent to ten percent.

The Uptown Partnership is currently working on a project to implement traffic calming measures on 4th, 5th and 6th Avenues. Traffic calming measures include a dedicated bus rapid transit lane on 4th Avenue and 5th Avenue, angled parking on 4th, 5th, and 6th Avenues, pedestrian-friendly crossings at intersections and at mid-block, and rerouting of bicycle traffic through Balboa Park on Balboa Drive. The project will improve the way people access Balboa Park by providing improved pedestrian links across 6th Avenue, by providing bus rapid transit with a station at Laurel, and by rerouting bicycle routes through the Park. Additional parking would be provided on 6th Avenue with the use of angled parking.

An independent organization called San Diego Electric Streetcar, Inc. is advocating restoration of electric streetcar service between the Hillcrest community and the downtown community via Balboa Park. The intent is for streetcars to operate along Park Boulevard, either adjacent to or in the existing right-of-way.

D. WHY UPDATE?

The Balboa Park Master Plan was adopted in 1989. Since that time, the growth of the surrounding communities and the region has increased considerably, and residential growth continues. The Downtown community has also continued to grow, and has placed demands on the Park that were not foreseen in 1989. With the increased demand on the Park from local, regional and international visitors, the need for parking in the Park has grown as well.

The role of regional transit as projected by the Master Plan has not been implemented. The Master Plan recommends that a light rail trolley line be provided on Park Boulevard, connecting

Downtown to Mission Valley. This trolley would connect two large visitor cores to Balboa Park. This has not happened, and SANDAG representatives indicate that it is very unlikely to happen.

The Master Plan identifies the Centre City Historic Trolley as a public transit system that would operate on 5th Avenue from C Street to L Street, and then share the LRT tracks along Harbor Drive to Seaport Village. The Master Plan recommends the extension of the Centre City Historic Trolley north to Laurel Street, which would connect Centre City, the Convention Center, Seaport Village and Balboa Park. This recommendation has not been implemented.

Access and parking for Balboa Park continue to be major issues. The community has expressed a desire to have additional parking within the Park at Park Boulevard Promenade workshops. The studies of the Park Boulevard Promenade have also supported the need for additional parking. Cultural institutions have projected future growth in attendance and will require additional parking to meet this need.

The current Balboa Park Master Plan states that the Plan should be subject to a periodic review every five (5) years with the first periodic review taking place in 1993. One reason for this Study is to provide this periodic review.

III STUDY OUTLINE

Providing an update to the Balboa Park Master Plan and Precise Plans is a significant task. The effort needed to seek community input, synthesize information, formulate recommendations and prepare policy documents for review and approval requires considerable time and resources. For this reason, the update or amendment to the Balboa Park Master Plan and Precise Plans has been divided into three phases of work. An outline of these phases is provided below. These phases and stages of the study and plan amendment process should not be confused with the phasing of recommendations outlined in this study.

A. PHASE I: LAND USE, CIRCULATION AND PARKING STUDY

The purpose of this Study is to provide an analysis of land use, circulation and parking for the Central Mesa and Inspiration Point areas of Balboa Park. The phases and stages listed below include a brief description. Please see Section IV, Stages of this Study, for additional information.

Stage 1: Discovery Stage – During this stage of the Study, the consultant team has reviewed all applicable policy documents that govern Balboa Park, reviewed adjacent Community Plans, reviewed recommendations of projects and studies adjacent to the Park, conducted numerous stakeholder interviews and walked and observed the park to learn more about how the park functions. The findings of the Discovery Stage were reported to the Balboa Park Committee and the community at a Public Forum held on April 3, 2003. This stage of the Study has been completed.

Stage 2: Findings and Options Stage – During this stage of the Study, the consultant team continued to conduct stakeholder interviews, and also held numerous workshops with Balboa Park organizations and institutions, community planning groups and City staff. The consultants used the information gathered in their previous efforts to generate separate options for addressing land use, circulation and parking. The options were then combined to create “scenarios”, or concepts, to provide a vision for the park. Three conceptual plans were prepared for community input. The options and conceptual plans were presented to the Balboa Park Committee and the community at a second Public Forum on July 10, 2003. A description of these options is provided below. This stage of the Study has been completed.

Stage 3: Preliminary Draft Plan Stage - This stage of the study consisted of refinement of the schematic plans based on input received at the second Public Forum as well as additional workshops that were held with the community planning groups, Park institutions and City staff. The refined conceptual plans were presented at the third Public Forum, which was held on October 2, 2003. This stage of the Study has been completed.

Stage 4: Draft Plan Stage - The outcome of the workshops leading up to the Preliminary Draft Plan Public Forum and the Public Forum itself is that a preferred plan has emerged. The preferred plan is being refined based on input received at the third Public Forum as well as a series of public workshops being held with the Balboa Park Committee. The Draft Plan was presented to the Balboa Park Committee and the community at a fourth Public Forum

held on January 15, 2004. A draft report documenting the Draft Plan will be available this January. Copies of this draft report will be provided to the Planning Commission as soon as it is available. This stage of the Study is underway.

Stage 5: Final Draft Plan Stage – The Final Draft Plan will be prepared based on input received from the fourth Public Forum, additional workshops with the Balboa Park Committee and workshops with the Planning Commission. The Final Draft Plan will be the basis of a request for authorization to initiate amendments to the Balboa Park Master Plan and applicable Precise Plans. This is a future stage of the Study.

B. PHASE II: PLAN AMENDMENT/UPDATE

With authorization from the Planning Commission to initiate amendments or updates to the Balboa Park Master Plan and applicable Precise Plans, the Park and Recreation Department will initiate the next phase of the project. Additional community input, stakeholder interviews and workshops will be held to further refine the plans. Additional in-depth studies will also be conducted to provide accurate and current information regarding land use, circulation and parking issues. This description is intended to give a general outline of the second phase of the study, and is not intended to be comprehensive. The results of Phase I will help guide Phase II.

C. PHASE III: IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the recommendations of this Study and subsequent Plan Amendments will be the third phase of the effort. Prioritization of recommendations, seeking funding and implementation will require considerable effort and support from the community and the region.

IV PUBLIC PROCESS

An integral part of this study has been to design and conduct a strategic and extensive outreach process. This process was designed to establish a context for the consultant team, and to listen and discuss options with stakeholders and community members to create a land use, circulation and parking strategy planned through consensus. The priority of the Study has been to develop a palette of concepts and plan elements acceptable to Park stakeholders, and implementation recommendations. Once a strong consensus is reached, Phase II of the study will focus on design details necessary to amend the pertinent portions of the Balboa Park Master Plan and applicable Precise Plans.

With an ambitious one-year time frame for study completion, efficient, productive dialogue has been critical to the outreach effort. While previous Park master plans and studies provide a litmus test as to what park stakeholders might accept with regard to treating parking and circulation within the Park, the most recent plan is ten years old. The challenge for the consultant team has been to focus the public dialogue in order to craft a Park-wide land use, circulation and parking plan for the public benefit. The recent Park Boulevard Promenade Plan proposal has established unifying and divisive themes, and provides a context for discussion of the Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study.

Organized into five stages – Discovery, Findings and Options, Preliminary Draft, Draft and Final Draft – the Study seeks to achieve input and feedback before and after each project milestone. A combination of outreach methods has been used to engage the public, communicate project milestones and meetings, and to solicit project feedback. The communication toolbox has included:

Balboa Park Committee Meetings: As the recognized planning group for Balboa Park, the Balboa Park Committee is serving the role of the steering committee. Members of Park and Recreation staff and the consultant team attend the monthly Balboa Park Committee meetings to provide project updates, answer questions and conduct workshops with the Committee.

Public Forums: Four public forums at key project milestones have allowed the community to provide input and feedback to the consultant team. Forum notices were distributed to a comprehensive mailing list of over 1,000 names, compiled using the local knowledge of City staff, LJ Black Consulting Group and Milford Wayne Donaldson. The list includes community planning group members and constituents, Park institutions, transportation officials, Zoo Working Group members, environmental groups, tourism industry, arts and culture, and elected and appointed officials. The list continues to grow.

Web Site: A project Web site, <http://www.jonesandjones.com/balboapark>, contains working papers, presentations, and the ability for the public to provide feedback via e-mail. To date, more than 150 people have provided project input via the web site.

Individual Stakeholder Interviews and Workshops: Over 1,000 stakeholder and public interviews, as well as over 30 focus group discussions and workshops, have

allowed the consultant team to gather baseline data, test concepts and refine plans. Interviews and workshops continue to be scheduled to discuss and refine the study recommendations.

Grass Roots: Along the way, Park and Recreation staff and the consultant team have sought efficiency in communications by using its partners in the Balboa Park Committee, neighborhood groups, City staff, Balboa Park Cultural Partnership and others to help disseminate information.

Client Team Meetings: Park and Recreation Department staff has met monthly with the consultant team and members of the Balboa Park Committee to seek input and direction on the study.

E-mail Announcements: An e-mail database with over 350 addresses has been assembled to distribute project notices.

Media: Press releases and media advisories announcing the public forums have been a staple of the outreach effort, resulting in broadcast and print media announcing and reporting on the meetings. Additionally, CityTV Television, the City-run cable station, taped the July and October forums and aired those programs continuously on public access television.

Presentations: The Park and Recreation staff and the consultant team have made presentations to local groups including neighborhood groups, the C3 Forum, the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, the Council of Design Professionals, Zoo volunteers group, and many more.

The study approach has identified cultural institutions, community leaders, elected officials, City staff and Park staff as key stakeholders. Please see Appendix F for a list of stakeholders.

Stage 1: Discovery - Where we are, where we want to go; analyze data, challenges and opportunities

In March 2003, the consultant team initiated the stakeholder outreach effort of the Balboa Park Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study to solicit valuable baseline data. Stakeholder interviews were held with representatives from the Balboa Park Committee, Balboa Park Cultural Partnership, Balboa Park Umbrella Committee, Friends of Balboa Park (formerly the Balboa Park Millennium Society), individual Park institutions, neighborhood planning groups (Uptown Planners, Greater Golden Hill Community Planning Group, Centre City Development Corporation and Greater North Park Planning Committee), Metropolitan Transit Development Board, Caltrans, Zoo, Naval Hospital, City College, San Diego Unified School District, City staff, tourism industry, and arts and culture organizations.

Balboa Park institutions provided the consultant team with visitor growth projections. Community planning groups voiced their concerns about access to parkland, quality of habitat and traffic impacts on the adjacent neighborhoods. Additionally, transportation consultants

TDA, Inc. conducted intercept surveys at the Park during peak and non-peak hours to gather information on current visitor travel patterns and demand. Data on visitor travel patterns had been collected and analyzed earlier as part of the Zoo's Park Boulevard Promenade Plan proposal. The results from TDA's surveys were used to validate this data.

The wider public contributed their valuable input at the first Public Forum, held on April 3, 2003 in the Balboa Park Club. The public was asked to provide facts, perceptions, ideas and concerns for their Balboa Park. Forum guests were also asked to validate or revise the vision for Balboa Park as identified in the Balboa Park Central Mesa Precise Plan (adopted in 1992). One hundred fifty people from a broad cross-section of Park stakeholders provided their input through hands-on, small group exercises designed to solicit opinions and ideas. The ideas are documented in the Discovery Stage White Paper (Appendix B). Through the forum, the original 1992 vision for Balboa Park was validated.

Through the Discovery phase, the consultants were made aware of various planning studies and proposals that would have an impact on parking and circulation around Balboa Park. In addition to the Park Boulevard Promenade Plan proposal, plans and proposals include the Downtown Community Plan Update, the Uptown Partnership's 4th, 5th and 6th Avenue Traffic Calming Plan, Caltrans' State Route 163 Corridor Management Plan, City College's expansion plans, Naval Hospital's expansion plans, PetCo Park's Parking Management Plan and individual expansion plans by Park institutions.

The consultant team also staffed a booth at the Earth Day Fair on April 27, 2003, seeking input from fair attendees on what they love about Balboa Park, what they feel could be improved, what the park should be in the future, and how land use and circulation could contribute to those visions. Hundreds of fair-goers stopped by the booth to contribute to the study. Their comments are listed in the Discovery Stage White Paper (Appendix B).

Stage 2: Findings and Options - Present concepts to begin developing consensus; ask stakeholders to identify preferred plan elements

During this stage of the study, the consultant team developed three options to test the information gathered during the Discovery Stage. With the goal of understanding the broad concepts and plan elements acceptable to stakeholders, the consultant team held workshops in June, 2003 with stakeholder groups including the Balboa Park Committee, community planning groups, Balboa Park Cultural Partnership, City staff, and Zoo staff to seek feedback on the three options.

The three options were refined based on input received in the June workshops, and the revised options were presented to the community at a second public forum held on July 10, 2003 at the Balboa Park Club. One hundred fifty people attended this forum, and the consultant team again utilized small group discussions designed to facilitate the gathering of input. Discussion topics focused on eliciting feedback on broad concepts such as reclamation of parkland, and specific elements such as shuttles and underground parking garages. This input would ultimately be used to develop the preliminary draft plan. The discussions elicited feedback representing the wide range of Park experiences. For example, residents from outside City limits and more distant

areas of the city spoke in favor of additional parking, while residents of adjacent communities encouraged pedestrian connections.

Additional stakeholder meetings were conducted with City special events staff, Zoo staff, and representatives from the disabled community, and others, to obtain additional feedback.

Stage 3: Preliminary Draft - Present a draft plan based on the consensus themes from stakeholder meetings

The three options were further refined based on input received during Stage 2 of the Study and the second public forum. In September, 2003, additional workshops were held with City staff, the Balboa Park Committee, community planning groups, Zoo staff and the Balboa Park Cultural Partnership to further test the three revised options. These workshops sought to validate an emerging preferred plan, and a clear consensus emerged around a strategy that balances the need for parkland with the needs of Park institutions.

During this stage, workshops were held with the Historical Resources Board Design Assistance Subcommittee, the Park and Recreation Design Review Committee and the Park and Recreation Board to continue to refine the plan.

A third public forum was held on October 2, 2003 to present the Preliminary Draft Plan. The Draft Plan included the features for addressing land use, circulation and parking within the Park, as well as financing, implementation and phasing strategies. One hundred thirty people attended the presentation at the Balboa Park Club, providing their feedback on the strategies and elements contained within the Preliminary Draft Plan through a spirited questions and answers period with the consultants. Additional handwritten surveys and follow-up e-mails were received as a result of the forum.

Currently, the preliminary draft plan is being refined by the consultant team to achieve a level of specificity for preparation of the Final Draft Plan. Stakeholder workshops have been scheduled with the Balboa Park Committee, special events coordinators, environmental organizations, recreational users, and the ADA community to finalize the plan elements.

Stage 4: Draft - Building consensus

During the past four months, Park and Recreation staff and the consultant team held focused workshops with the Balboa Park Committee to discuss the issues related to the five main principles established for the Park. The consultant team has used the input from these workshops to refine the implementation strategy for the Study. Additional information on these workshops can be found in Section IV of this report. The Draft Plan was presented to the community at the fourth public forum held January 15, 2004, at the Balboa Park Club. The community posed questions directly to the consultant team with each question projected onto a video screen and answered to the public's satisfaction.

Stage 5: Final Draft - The consensus plan

Stage 5 of the Study is currently in progress. The goals of this stage are to gain consensus on the recommendations of the Study, complete the Study report and to receive authorization from the Planning Commission to initiate amendments to the Balboa Park Master Plan and applicable Precise Plans in order to implement the recommendations of the Study. Additional workshops and meetings are planned with the Balboa Park Committee, the Park and Recreation Design Review Committee, the Park and Recreation Board and the Planning Commission.

V STAGES OF THE STUDY

The Balboa Park Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study has been in progress since January of 2003, with an initial meeting between the Balboa Park Committee and the consultant team. The Study has completed the first three stages as noted above, and is currently in the fourth stage. More detailed descriptions of the activities and findings of each stage are provided below.

A. STAGE 1: DISCOVERY STAGE

The Discovery Stage of the Study was intended to familiarize the consultant team with Balboa Park, the policy documents that govern and influence the Park, past studies and working group papers, issues affecting the Park, and communities that use the Park. All relevant policy documents were reviewed and numerous stakeholder interviews were held. The initial findings during this stage were used to formulate the findings and options discussed in Stage 2.

Development in Balboa Park is guided by the Balboa Park Master Plan, the Central Mesa Precise Plan and the East Mesa Precise Plan. The surrounding communities of Greater North Park, Greater Golden Hill, Uptown and Centre City also have community plans that guide development in their respective areas, and all acknowledge Balboa Park as a valuable cultural and recreational resource. There have also been numerous studies and past master plans for Balboa Park, including the 1960 Master Plan prepared by Harland Bartholomew Associates and numerous other documents. Please see the list of reference documents on page 36 of the Discovery White Paper attached to this report.

Considerable community input was solicited during this stage of the Study. In addition to the monthly Balboa Park Committee meetings, individual and group stakeholder interviews were held during this stage. The first Public Forum, held on April 3, 2003, was also used as a resource for gathering input from the community. After an initial presentation, attendees of the forum were grouped into tables of approximately ten to twelve each and were encouraged to express their thoughts, concerns and goals for Balboa Park. The consultants also established a web site for the project where people could review the progress of the project, download documents and graphics, and provide input.

Due to the volume of input and information gathered during the Discovery Stage of the project, it is difficult to summarize it all within this report. The White Paper prepared by the consultant team for the Discovery Stage of the project is attached to this report for your reference.

B. STAGE 2: FINDINGS AND OPTIONS STAGE

The Findings and Options Stage of the Study was intended to continue the information gathering process, synthesize the information, report the findings of the Discovery Stage and formulate options for addressing land use, circulation and parking issues. Stakeholder interviews with individuals and groups continued throughout this phase. Also, workshops were held with the Balboa Park Committee, Balboa Park organizations and institutions, and community planning groups.

The consultant team conducted over 800 on-site interviews of park visitors over a three day period in April, 2003 in an effort to understand how visitors get to the park, what they do, how long they stay and where they come from. The consultant team also set up a booth at EarthFair 2003 to solicit input from a large group of Park users. A copy of the visitor survey, the results of the survey, and comments received at EarthFair 2003 are contained in the Discovery White Paper attached to this report.

Additional information was gathered and disseminated through the project web site at <http://www.jonesandjones.com/balboapark>. Web site visitors are able to post e-mails with comments to the consultant team, and are able to download white papers, graphics and other information.

FINDINGS

Balboa Park has been a park since its establishment in 1868. The history of the Park is extensive, and there have been many policies and decisions made in the past. It is important to note that many of the findings of the consultant team are not new, and that many have been previously identified in the Master Plan and Precise Plans.

Park Integrity – Some of the key findings regarding Park integrity are as follows:

- The Park landscape is diverse but fragmented.
- The Park is heavily used in a few concentrated areas while many other parts of the Park remain unused or unknown.
- The Park is fragmented due to topography, roadways and freeways, fencing and land use restrictions.

Public Access – Some of the key findings regarding public access are as follows:

- Many of the Park's largest open tracts of land remain under-utilized or inaccessible.
- 583 acres of the Park are publicly accessible without restriction.
- 413 acres are accessible to the general public for a fee.
- 227 acres of the Park have been extracted for roads, schools and hospitals.
- 177 acres of the Park have restricted access (inaccessible to the general public).

Activity Cores – Balboa Park has four distinct activity cores. These cores include the Prado, the Palisades, the Zoo and Inspiration Point. Some key findings regarding these activity cores are as follows.

- The Prado is considered as the core of Balboa Park.
- The Prado is the most heavily used portion of the Park.
- The Prado and its buildings act as an incubator for institutions.
- The Palisades is the second largest activity core.
- The Palisades is more diverse than the Prado, and contains a mixture of museums, recreational facilities, community meeting facilities, gardens, entertainment and the International Cottages.

- Inspiration Point is an emerging mixed use core of the Park.
- Inspiration Point is dominated by parking lots.
- The existing cultural institutions at Inspiration Point require additional “critical mass” to survive.

Two additional activity cores outside the study area but within Balboa Park include the East Mesa/Morley Field and the West Mesa. Some key findings regarding these activity cores are as follows.

- The East Mesa is dominated by structured recreational activities.
- Florida Canyon and the Arizona Landfill are under-utilized park resources.
- Wildlife habitat is a key part of preserving Florida Canyon as open space.
- The East Mesa provides a traditional park setting to the adjacent communities.
- The West Mesa is viewed by many as the Uptown District’s community park.
- Marston Point provides wonderful views to Downtown as well as the Palisades area of the Park, but is cut off from access to these areas.

Access – Visitors to Balboa Park arrive by a number of methods, including auto, public transit, walk, bike, tour bus and drop-off. The following are some of the key findings regarding how people access the Park.

Auto Arrival

- 25% of vehicles entering the Central Mesa come from the west across the Cabrillo Bridge.
- 50% of vehicles entering the Central Mesa come from the south on Park Boulevard.
- 10% of vehicles entering the Central Mesa come from the north on Park Boulevard.
- 15% of vehicles entering the Central Mesa come from the east on Zoo Drive.
- Of these access points (Cabrillo Bridge, Park Boulevard, Zoo Drive), all roads are considered ample for the average daily traffic they receive.

Visitor Arrival

- 81% of Park visitors arrive by car.
- 5% of Park visitors arrive by public transit.
- 4% of Park visitors arrive by bike or walking.
- 4% of Park visitors arrive by tour bus.
- 4% of Park visitors are dropped off.
- 2% of Park visitors arrive by other unspecified means.

Average Daily Traffic

Studies conducted by the City of San Diego Transportation Department and the San Diego Zoo indicate that the main roads serving the Central Mesa operate within their design standards. The table below indicates the roads, their carrying capacity and their current demand. The numbers indicated are trips per day.

Road Name	Capacity	Current Demand
El Prado	8,000	5,000
Park Blvd. (south of Zoo Place)	40,000	19,000
Park Blvd. (north of Zoo Place)	40,000	15,000
Zoo Place	10,000	7,000

Existing Parking Supply and Demand

Analysis of the existing parking supply (based on actual counts) and parking demand (based on attendance records of the various Park attractions and field counts) indicates that parking is not located conveniently for Park visitors. The number of parking lots and their inconvenient locations results in visitors “hunting” for parking as close to their destinations as possible. This “hunting” results in additional unnecessary traffic throughout the Central Mesa. The following table indicates the existing supply and demand of the four major areas of the Central Mesa based on percentages.

Area	Supply	Demand
Zoo/War Memorial Building	51%	58%
El Prado	14%	38%
Palisades	18%	3%
Inspiration Point	17%	1%

The following table identifies parking locations and quantities within the Central Mesa and Inspiration Point areas of Balboa Park.

Location	# of Spaces
Zoo/Spanish Village Area	
Zoo Lot	2,831
Zoo Place (street)	93
Carousel Lot (south)	215
Carousel Lot (north)	103
Park Blvd. (street)	56
El Prado Area	
Pepper Grove North	176
Casa de Balboa	95
Alcazar Garden	118
Plaza de Panama	78
Pepper Grove South	118

Natural History Museum	101
Park Blvd. (street)	169
Village Place (street)	72
Palisades Area	
Organ Pavilion	367
Palisades Lot	302
Federal Building	519
Gold Gulch	44
Inspiration Point Area	
Inspiration Point	1,090
TOTAL	6,547

Employee Parking

A key finding regarding parking supply and demand is that the employees, volunteers and docents for the various park attractions use a majority of the available close-in parking. Since these employees arrive first in the morning, most available close-in parking is filled by the time the institutions are open to the public. Employees, volunteers and docents use approximately 26% of the parking available in the Zoo/War Memorial parking lot, 88% of the parking in the Prado area, and 13% of the parking in the Palisades area. However, employees only use 4% of the parking available in the Inspiration Point area. The findings listed above under “Parking Supply and Demand” indicate that the parking at Inspiration Point is the most under-utilized in the Central Mesa.

Pedestrian Circulation

- The pedestrian network is fragmented.
- Many areas within the Park are under-served or isolated.
- There are too few connections across the canyons.
- There are limited connections to the surrounding neighborhoods and downtown.

Special Events

Over 2,575,000 Park visitors attended special events last year. In mapping the locations of those special events, a majority occurred in the Prado and Palisades areas of the Park. Several special events occurred on the West Mesa along 6th Avenue just north of the Prado and several occurred at or adjacent to the War Memorial Building adjacent to Roosevelt Junior High School. Since special events occur primarily on weekends, this indicates additional heavy use beyond day-to-day park activities.

Visitor Transportation Survey

The consultant team conducted surveys of visitors to the Central Mesa of Balboa Park on April 24th, 25th and 26th, 2003. The interviews were conducted adjacent to the Aerospace

Museum, Automotive Museum, RH Fleet Science Center, Japanese Friendship Garden, Museum of Man, Organ Pavilion, Pepper Grove, Zoo and along the Prado. The following are the results of the surveys.

Table 1: Number of Interviews by General Location

Location	# Interviewed	% of Total
Prado	305	36.8%
Zoo	184	22.2%
Organ Pavilion	138	16.7%
Palisades	114	13.8%
Pepper Grove	80	9.7%
Other	7	0.8%
TOTAL	828	100.0%

Table 2: Percentage of Visitors by Mode of Travel

Mode	Thursday 4-24-03	Friday 4-25-03	Saturday 4-26-03
Auto	81.9%	81.7%	78.6%
Transit	3.8%	1.7%	6.7%
Tour Bus	2.1%	6.3%	6.0%
Walk/Bike	4.2%	6.3%	3.1%
Dropped Off	5.5%	0.6%	3.8%
Other	2.5%	3.4%	1.4%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The majority of visitors arrive by car. Transit use varies by day of the week with higher use on weekends. On average, about 5% of visitors ride transit to the park.

Table 3: Visitors' Route of Arrival

Street	Thursday 4-24-03	Friday 4-25-03	Saturday 4-26-03
Park Blvd.	72%	72%	84%
Laurel St./El Prado	25%	26%	14%
Upas St./Pershing Dr.	3%	2%	2%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 4: Average Vehicle Occupancy

Persons per Vehicle	Thursday 4-24-03	Friday 4-25-03	Saturday 4-26-03
Zoo Visitors	3.61	3.44	4.12
Other Visitors	2.92	2.97	3.06

People use their cars very efficiently on their trips to the Park. These levels of auto occupancy exceed those for almost any other trip purpose. They reflect the family nature of trips to the cultural institutions and the zoo.

Table 5: Visitors' Place of Residence

Place of Residence	Number of Responses	Percent
City of San Diego	239	30.8%
San Diego Metro Area	187	24.1%
Other California	165	21.3%
Out of State	185	23.8%
TOTAL	776	100%

Nearly 70% of visitors come from outside the City of San Diego. This geographic distribution underscores the preference for auto access.

Table 6: Average Length of Stay

Hours of Stay	Thursday 4-24-03	Friday 4-25-03	Saturday 4-26-03
Central Mesa Visitors	2:59	3:25	3:13
Zoo Visitors	4:07	5:30	4:51

Zoo visitors had noticeably longer lengths of stay than visitors to cultural institutions and other activities in the Central Mesa.

Table 7: Average Number of Sites Visited

	Thursday 4-24-03	Friday 4-25-03	Saturday 4-26-03
Central Mesa Visitors	2.8	2.9	2.6
Zoo Visitors	1.3	1.5	2.1

Visitors to the Prado, Palisades, Pepper Grove and Inspiration Point tend to visit nearly 3 sites per trip to the park. Zoo visitors tend to visit less than two sites during their time in the park. The number of sites visited underscores the benefit of grouping many activities together in Balboa Park – visitors can stay longer and do more while parking once than they could were these destinations located separately.

Table 8: Destinations

<u>Destination</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Museum	652	31.7%
Garden	446	21.7%
Walk/Recreation	278	13.5%
Other	266	12.9%
Zoo	224	10.9%
Eat	139	6.8%
Picnic	50	2.4%
TOTAL	2,055	100%

Table 9: Parking Destinations Used

<u>Parking Location</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Zoo	24.4%
Organ Pavilion	17.9%
Science Center	9.9%
Pepper Grove	8.7%
On-Street	7.6%
Pan America Plaza	7.3%
Natural History Museum	6.8%
Alcazar Garden	5.9%
Inspiration Point	5.3%
Plaza de Panama	2.8%
Spanish Village	2.3%
House of Hospitality	1.1%
TOTAL	100%

Table 10: Parking Counts – Central Mesa and Inspiration Point

The following table is a count of the total number of cars within the Central Mesa and Inspiration Point by time of day on the days noted.

<u>Time of Day</u>	<u>Saturday</u> 8-5-00	<u>Sunday</u> 8-6-00	<u>Friday</u> 4-25-03	<u>Saturday</u> 4-26-03
8:00 AM	607	438		
9:00 AM				
10:00 AM	2,434	2,075	3,060	2,793
11:00 AM			3,694	3,744
12:00 PM	3,919	4,504	4,292	4,219
1:00 PM			4,776	4,642
2:00 PM	4,459	5,187	4,641	4,958
3:00 PM			4,154	4,921
4:00 PM	3,861	4,219	3,525	4,855
5:00 PM			3,168	3,706
6:00 PM	3,182	3,065		

This table simply compares the observed parking demand during our April 2003 survey with a previous summer survey conducted for the Park Promenade planning effort. It indicates very similar levels of demand, confirming that the April observations reflected conditions comparable to summer periods.

Table 11: Cultural Institutions' Attendance

<u>Institution</u>	<u>2002 Attendance</u>
Aerospace Museum	149,838
Automotive Museum	95,824
Centro Cultural de la Raza	22,701
Hall of Champions	50,212
House of Hospitality	483,262
Japanese Friendship Garden	96,209
Marston House	4,502
Mingei Museum	91,405
Museum of Art	335,477
Museum of Man	221,861
Museum of Photographic Arts	96,826
Natural History Museum	214,735
Old Globe Theatre	218,119
RH Fleet Science Center	464,449
San Diego Historical Society	62,165
Model Railroad Museum	95,805
Timken Art Gallery	87,089
Veterans Museum	39,500
World Beat Center	29,379
TOTAL	2,859,358

OPTIONS

After analysis of all relevant information pertaining to the Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study, and based on input received from the Balboa Park Committee and the community, the consultant team prepared three options for addressing park needs. Each of the options is intended to address issues regarding the park landscape, transit, community links and parking. Recommendations common to each of the options include the following.

Landscape

- Reclaim parking areas in key locations for plazas, gardens and landscapes.
- Roads become parkways.
- Close Florida Drive and establish a system of trails.
- Create gateways at main Park entries.
- Make roadway rights-of-way more pedestrian friendly.

Enhanced Regional Transit

- Strengthen 4th and 5th Avenue corridors and connect regional networks to the Park.
- Increase service on Park Blvd., including Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and other regional options.
- Stronger connection to the Bay-to-Park Corridor.

Community Links

- Strengthen links to surrounding neighborhoods with a network of accessible paths, trails and bikeways. Strengthen existing connections and build new ones where needed.
- Enhance, reinforce and create connections across mesas with bridges, linking to the trail and pathway network.

Parking

- Minimize/manage parking in pedestrian cores (Prado, Palisades, etc.).
- Minimize land requirements of future parking needs.
- Minimize visual impacts of parking (remove, bury, structure, buffer, etc.).
- Distribute parking equitably.
- Manage and maintain on-street parking where appropriate.
- Limit expansion of parking to remove parking.
- Manage service access.
- Provide suitable disabled parking access.
- Capture parking at main Park destinations.
- Provide a more efficient shuttle loop to connect parking areas with destinations.

The recommendations listed above are common to all three options. The primary differences between options are the phasing of the overall plan, the strategy governing the locations of the parking and the overall quantity of the parking provided.

Option A – Option A places the priority on addressing immediate shortfalls in the parking and circulation system both in number and destination.

- Provide a centralized parking structure at the Zoo (Park Boulevard Promenade Plan) and a remote parking structure at Inspiration Point.
- Provide remote parking for Zoo employees.
- Connect the parking structures and destinations with an efficient loop shuttle system.

Land Use

With the exception of the existing zoo parking lot, returned to general park uses in the first phase, this option initiates the majority of land use changes in its second phase. With new parking structures in place, development reclaims surface lots, among them the Pan American Plaza, the Organ Pavilion lot, the Alcazar lot, and portions of Inspiration Point, for garden and general park uses. The Arizona Landfill is also reclaimed in this second phase. The final phase of development closes the northern portion of Florida Canyon to vehicles and enhances existing habitat and trails in this portion of the park.

Short Term

- Return existing Zoo surface parking lot to Zoo/Park use
- Park Promenade buffered pedestrian zone along Park Boulevard
- Gateway enhancements
- Convert Alcazar surface parking lot to parkland
- Convert Organ Pavilion surface parking lot to parkland
- Convert edges of Inspiration Point to parkland
- Remove parking from Pan American Plaza and restore to historic garden use
- Re-design Plaza de Panama to be more pedestrian friendly

Long Term

- Reclaim Arizona Landfill and return to general Park use
- Close northern portion of Florida Drive and enhance native habitat

Circulation

This option reserves circulation improvements for the final phase of development. Pedestrian bridges connecting the mesas and loop trail systems circling each mesa and the park itself are constructed after parking and parkland issues have been addressed.

Short Term

- New Park-wide shuttle system concentrating on the Prado, Palisades and Zoo areas
- Open northern end of Spanish Village for through pedestrian traffic
- Extend Prado axis to the East Mesa via a pedestrian/circulator bridge
- Strengthen transit access to the East Mesa

Long Term

- Universally accessible trail system looping each mesa
- Universally accessible trail system looping entire Park
- Connect Palisades & Marston Point with pedestrian bridge
- Connect Inspiration Point & Golden Hill with pedestrian bridge
- Connect West and Central Mesas across Cabrillo Canyon at key locations
- Create planted median and bike lane amenities on Pershing Drive

Parking

This option concentrates parking in two large structures, one central and one remote, and focuses initial efforts on resolving the Park's immediate parking issues. The parking reservoirs provided in this option provide the greatest overall number of parking spaces

between the three options, and provided for future user growth with little assumed use of public transportation.

Both parking garages are assigned to the initial phase of development. The central garage, providing 4,800 parking spaces, would occupy the Zoo's existing southern surface parking lot and would offer parking equally convenient to the Zoo and Prado attractions. A second remote parking structure providing 3,500 parking spaces would be located at Inspiration Point. This structure would serve employees, volunteers, and overflow visitor needs. An enhanced park shuttle system would be provided connecting the parking structures and Park destinations.

A Zoo staff parking facility with approximately 460 parking spaces located at the northwest portion of the Zoo would be provided if demand at the Inspiration Point parking structure reaches capacity.

Short Term

- 4,800 car parking structure in the Zoo/Prado area
- 3,500 car parking structure at Inspiration Point

Long Term

- 460 car surface parking lot at northwest portion of the Zoo for Zoo employee parking

Option B – Option B focuses on balancing Park integrity (habitat quality, parkland fragmentation) and Park user needs (parking, circulation) by making concurrent improvements to both.

- An integrated approach that seeks to improve Park integrity and address parking and circulation issues concurrently.
- Encourages public transportation use, but allows for modest future increases in user traffic.

Land Use

Parallel to its circulation strategy, Option B splits land use improvements between mid and final development phases. Phase two improvements include a large-scale reclamation in each of the three activity cores. Plaza de Panama will be returned to a pedestrian plaza with some allowance for valet and accessible parking needs. The Organ Pavilion surface lot will revert to parkland. The Pan American Plaza will also be restored to pedestrian space supported by the newly constructed parking structure behind the Hall of Champions and Inspiration Point's south, and west edges will be naturalized.

Another opportunity for expanding usable open space within the Park and addressing the future recreational demands on Balboa Park is to reclaim the Arizona Landfill as parkland. Implementing the recommendations of the East Mesa Precise Plan is strongly supported by this Option. The reclaimed Arizona Landfill will also create an improved terminus for the Prado axis extension also taking place in this phase.

Final phase improvements target remaining surface lots. The northern portion of Florida Canyon will be closed to vehicles, with enhanced habitat complementing the inter- and intra-mesa trails systems also created in this phase.

Conversion of the Zoo's existing primary surface lot would take place in the initial phase of development.

Short Term

- Return existing Zoo surface lot to general Park use
- Park Promenade (buffered pedestrian zone) along Park Boulevard
- Gateway enhancements
- Remove parking from Pan-American Plaza; restore to historic garden use
- Redesign Plaza de Panama to be more pedestrian-friendly
- Convert Organ pavilion surface parking to parkland
- Reclaim Arizona Landfill; return to general Park use

Long Term

- Close northern portion of Florida Canyon to vehicles; enhance habitat
- Convert edges of Inspiration Point to parkland
- Convert Alcazar surface parking to parkland

Circulation

This option splits circulation improvement between mid and final phases of development. Phase two opts for an important triad of mesa linkages: the Prado axis is extended via a bridge to the East Mesa, a Palisades pedestrian bridge connects with Marston Point, and then onward to the Downtown along the 8th Street corridor and an Inspiration Point land bridge stretches to Golden Hill. This selection of bridges will increase access to the Central Mesa at each of its three important edges. The development of these new bridge connections needs to be accompanied by the enhancement of Balboa Park's path system. The goal to make the Park universally accessible to all shall be a priority.

Short Term

- Open north end of Spanish Village for through pedestrian traffic

Long Term

- New Park-wide circulator system concentrating on Prado/Palisades/Zoo area
- Universally accessible trail system looping each mesa
- Universally accessible trail system looping the entire Park
- Extend Prado axis to East Mesa via pedestrian/circulator bridge
- Strengthen transit access to East Mesa
- Connect Palisades & Marston Point with pedestrian bridge
- Connect Inspiration Point & Golden Hill with pedestrian bridge
- Connect West and Central Mesas across Cabrillo Canyon at key locations
- Create planted median and bike lane amenities on Pershing Drive

Parking

This option removes parking from the Prado and Palisades cores and redistributes it among a series of small garages on the periphery of these high activity areas. Parkland reclamation and parking improvements are implemented concurrently. This option offers a compromise on parking, providing less than Option A but more than Option C; this provision of parking assumes a modest increase in the use of public transportation.

Option B begins park improvements by constructing a central parking structure, containing 3200–3500 spaces, on the site of the Zoo's southern parking lot. The Zoo's large central surface lot would be returned to parkland, while a 100± -space surface parking lot on the northern portion of that facility would be retained to support the war Memorial Building.

Second phase parking improvements would include a 2200–2500-space remote parking facility at Inspiration Point, serviced by an enhanced park circulator, serving volunteer, employee, and overflow parking. Smaller structures of approximately 500–750 spaces would be constructed in the final phase; these structures would be located adjacent to the Globe Theater (under the Cabrillo Bridge on the site of the current archery range), near the Fleet Science Center, and behind the Hall of Champions. Dependent upon demand on the Inspiration Point structure, an additional, similarly sized surface off Richmond Street would also be built in this final phase, providing staff parking for the Zoo.

Option C – Option C prioritizes enhancing and restoring the Park fabric itself before addressing user-specific needs.

- An aggressively environmental approach that seeks to improve overall Park integrity before addressing parking/circulation issues.
- Encourages increased public transportation use as key component of short-term and long-term solutions to parking/circulation issues.

Land Use

Option C prioritizes park improvements that may be immediately realized and that are not dependent on companion improvements in parking or circulation. This approach focuses on improving parkland physically through restoration and reclamation and functionally by improving connectivity and extending trail and habitat systems.

Initial improvements reclaim two large portions of parkland by restoring the Arizona Landfill and closing the northern portion of Florida canyon to vehicular traffic. Portions of Inspiration Point would also be re-planted for passive park uses in this first phase of redevelopment.

Phase two takes advantage of the creation of replacement parking in a central structure to convert surface lots, including the Plaza de Panama and Pan American Plaza, to parkland, plazas and gardens. The final phase of development reclaims as parkland those lots not converted in Phase two, including the Organ Pavilion lot.

Short Term

- Return existing Zoo surface lot to Zoo/Park use
- Reclaim Arizona Landfill; return to general Park use
- Redesign Plaza de Panama to be more pedestrian friendly
- Close northern portion of Florida Drive to vehicles; enhance habitat
- Convert edges of Inspiration Point to parkland
- Park Promenade (buffered pedestrian zone) along Park Boulevard
- Gateway enhancements

Long Term

- Remove parking from Pan-American Plaza; restore to historic garden use
- Convert Alcazar surface parking to parkland
- Convert Organ pavilion surface parking to parkland

Circulation

Option C looks to maximize internal park connections and external park access. Phase one improvements include pedestrian bridges connecting all three mesas, and a reconfiguration of the golf course to draw the public into the East Mesa, the Prado axis is extended via a bridge to the East Mesa, a Palisades pedestrian bridge connects with Marston Point, and then onward to the Downtown along the 8th Street corridor and an Inspiration Point land bridge stretches to Golden Hill. This selection of bridges will increase access to the Central Mesa at each of its three important edges. The development of these new bridge connections needs to be accompanied by the enhancement of Balboa Park's path system. The goal to make the Park universally accessible to all shall be a priority. Phase two improvements would include trail systems looping each mesa and the entire park.

Short Term

- Create planted median and bike lane amenities on Pershing Drive
- New Park-wide shuttle system concentrating on Prado/Palisades/Zoo area
- Extend Prado axis to East Mesa via pedestrian/circulator bridge
- Connect Palisades & Marston Point with pedestrian bridge
- Connect Inspiration Point & Golden Hill with pedestrian bridge
- Connect West and Central Mesas across Cabrillo
- Canyon at key locations

Long Term

- Open north end of Spanish Village for through-pedestrian traffic
- Universally accessible perimeter trail system around each mesa
- Universally accessible perimeter trail system around Park
- Strengthen transit access to East Mesa

Parking

This option addresses parkland connectivity and landscape integrity before implementing parking and circulation improvements. Parking improvements emphasizing an employee and volunteer parking management strategy, Option C concentrates the parking demand in two large garages at the periphery of the Central Mesa. This option offers the smallest parking reservoir of the three options, and relies heavily on increased use of public transportation to meet future user growth.

An enhanced park shuttle encourages more efficient use of existing parking, particularly the remote parking facility in Inspiration Point, in phase one. No new parking is created in this initial development phase.

Phase two constructs a central garage, providing 3200–3500 spaces, utilizing the bulk of the Zoo’s existing surface lot. Land not occupied by the new garage or Zoo exhibits would return to general Park use during this phase. Final improvements would replace the Inspiration Point surface lots with structured parking, offering 2200–2500 spaces, and replace the Organ Pavilion lot with a 500–750-car parking structure behind the Hall of Champions.

Short Term

- 460-car employee surface parking lot off Richmond Street
- 3200-car parking structure in Zoo/Prado area

Long Term

- 3000-car parking structure at Inspiration Point
- 1000-car parking structure at West Mesa

C. STAGE 3: PRELIMINARY DRAFT PLAN STAGE

The three options described above were presented to the Balboa Park Committee and the community at the Findings and Options Public Forum held on July 10, 2003. Based on the input received at the Public Forum and in the workshops immediately prior to the Public Forum, a general consensus evolved that Option B was the preferred option, but should include some elements from both Option A and Option C.

The participants felt that Option A, which addresses only parking needs to alleviate current parking issues in the Park, did not provide any benefit to the Park integrity and did not provide any improved access to parkland. Conversely, they felt that Option C, which focused on Park improvements relating to increased access to parkland, did not adequately address the parking and vehicular circulation issues in the Park. The participants felt that Option C relied too heavily on public transit, which has been slow in development in the City and region. The general consensus was that Option B, which attempts to provide a balance between Park improvements and parking improvements, would provide the best mix of development for Balboa Park to meet current and future needs.

The Preliminary Draft Plan Stage of the Study included ongoing stakeholder interviews and workshops as well as additional workshops with the Balboa Park Committee. The consultant team also received numerous letters and e-mails regarding the options. The consultant team continued to develop Option B as the preferred plan and began incorporating the desired elements of the other options as well as additional input received. The Preliminary Draft Plan was presented to the Balboa Park Committee and the community at a third Public Forum on October 2, 2003. Much of the background information presented at the Public Forum was the same as at the previous Forum, and was included as a reminder of the information presented at the second Forum. However, the recommendations were revised based on community input.

GOALS

Land Use Goals

- Reclaim landscapes - net increase of usable parkland: 102 acres
 - Arizona landfill: 49.6 acres +/-
 - Inspiration Point: 23.5 acres +/-
 - Archery range: 9.5 acres +/-
- Reclaim pedestrian/park character of surface lots (limited parking): 8.5 +/- acres (Alcazar, Plaza de Panama, Pan American Plaza, Organ Pavilion)
- Use natural landscapes to connect:
 - Habitats and mesas
 - Destinations and neighborhoods

- Park roads become “parkways”
- Entry points become “gateways”
- Strengthen uses at all destinations (activity cores)
- Balance visitor needs with Park needs
- Reclaim restricted and extracted lands, wherever possible
- Reclaim Zoo lot for parkland (Zoo exhibits)

Circulation Goals

- Emphasize pedestrian movement and environments
- Connect mesas across canyons
- Connect Park to neighborhoods and Downtown
- Expand accessible trails and paths throughout Park
- Provide in-Park “people mover” Trolley
 - East/west from 6th to Pershing
 - North/south from Plaza de Panama to Pan American Plaza
- Improve Park-wide way-finding system
- Enhance Park-wide lighting system
- Extended Park Promenade with green belt

Parking Goals

- Rely on modest increase of public transportation
 - provide for future transit (BRT)
 - coordinate and connect to regional and local service with Park shuttle system
- Locate new parking garages at key access points to destination areas
- Develop and institute Park-wide employee parking management plan
- Develop and institute visitor parking management plan (including short-term parking)
- Provide shuttle service between parking and destinations
- Enhance valet parking system to encourage and support evening uses in Central Prado
- Phase expanded service to other activity areas as needed

RECOMMENDATIONS

The follow table contains the recommendations made in the Preliminary Draft Plan of the Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study. Many of the recommendations have already been made in the adopted 1989 Balboa Park Master Plan, the 1992 Central Mesa Precise Plan, and the 1993 East Mesa Precise Plan. Other recommendations are additions to the current policy documents as proposed by this Study or by the Park Boulevard Promenade Plan.

Balboa Park Master Plan (BPMP)
 Central Mesa Precise Plan (CMPP)
 East Mesa Precise Plan (EMPP)
 Park Boulevard Promenade Plan (PBPP)
 Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study (LUCP)

	BPMP	CMPP	EMPP	PBPP	LUCP
Land Use					
• Return existing Zoo surface lot to general Park use (Zoo exhibits)				●	●
• Provide Park Promenade and landscaped buffered pedestrian zone along Park Boulevard				●	●
• Remove parking from Pan-American Plaza; restore to historic garden use	●	●			●
• Redesign Plaza de Panama to be more pedestrian friendly	●	●			●
• Convert Organ pavilion surface parking to parkland	●	●			●
• Reclaim Arizona Landfill and return to general Park use	●		●		●
• Reclaim surface parking areas and I-5 perimeter of Inspiration Point, and return to general Park use	●				●
• Improve in-Park roadways to provide sidewalks and bike paths	●				●
• Close northern portion of Florida Drive to vehicles and enhance canyon habitat	●		●		●
• Extend the proposed Park Boulevard Promenade south to C Street, connecting to the regional transit system					●
• Convert Alcazar Garden surface parking to parkland					●
Circulation					
• Open north end of Spanish Village for through pedestrian traffic	●	●		●	
• Gateway enhancements at key entry points to Park					●
• New Park-wide Shuttle system concentrating on Prado/Palisades/Zoo area/Inspiration Point	●	●			●
• Universally accessible trail system around the perimeter of each mesa	●	●	●		●
• Universally accessible trail system around the perimeter of entire Park	●				●
• Extend Prado pedestrian axis to East Mesa via pedestrian/people-mover trolley bridge			●		●
• Strengthen transit access to East and West Mesas		●			●
• Connect Palisades & Marston Point with pedestrian bridge					●
• Connect Marston Point to Cortez Hill/Downtown along 8th Avenue corridor with pedestrian bridge	●				●
• Connect Inspiration Point & Golden Hill with pedestrian bridge	●		●		●
• Connect new archery range parking to 6th by bridge at Quince					●
• Improve Park roadways to parkways, include bike lanes and sidewalks, amenities on Pershing Drive, Upas & 26th, etc			●		●
• Connect park to regional transit network, BRT, Metro buses, and light rail system (streetcar)	●	●		●	●

	BPMP	CMPP	EMPP	PBPP	LUCP
Parking					
• Institute Employee/Volunteer Parking Management Plan	●	●			●
• Institute Visitor Parking Management Plan	●	●			●
• Build underground car parking structure in Park Promenade area for Zoo				●	●
• Build parking structure at Inspiration Point for employee parking, overflow Park users, and Palisades users					●
• Build terraced parking structure at archery range for west Prado users					●
• Build Zoo employee parking lot on the northwestern edge of the existing Zoo leasehold				●	●
• Strengthen valet parking system					●

D. STAGE 4: DRAFT PLAN STAGE

The Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study is currently in the Draft Plan Stage. During this Stage, additional stakeholder interviews and workshops will be held to further refine the recommendations of the Study. A fourth Public Workshop was held on January 15, 2004, to present the most recent recommendations of the Study to the community and to seek additional input.

The Balboa Park Committee and the consultant team have had a series of workshops, with each workshop addressing one of the topics listed below. In these workshops, the Balboa Park committee has discussed a number of questions and has supported the following directions.

Balboa Park Committee Workshop #1 - Reclaim, Restore and Conserve Parkland

Reclaim Parkland - The Balboa Park Committee supports the general policy of reclaiming parkland. To accomplish this policy, the Committee supports the conversion of surface parking lots within the core of the Central Mesa to parkland and gardens, with relocation of the lost parking to other areas of the Central Mesa and/or into parking structures. The specifics of the parking are covered in a subsequent category. There is general consensus that the Plaza de Panama, the Alcazar Garden parking lot, the Organ Pavilion parking lot, the Palisades parking lot and the Federal Building parking lot should be reclaimed as parkland. The Balboa Park Committee has also supported the Park Boulevard Promenade Plan, which reclaims the Zoo parking lot, the Carousel parking lot, the Spanish Village parking lot and the North Prado parking lot. Reclamation of other parkland includes the Pershing Drive maintenance yard and the Navy Hospital land. With the exception of the Navy Hospital land, the reclamation of the Alcazar Garden parking lot and the Federal Building parking lot, these recommendations are consistent with the goals and policies of the Master Plan and Precise Plans. The reclamation of the

parking lots and reclamation of parkland in general is consistent with the goals and policies of the Master Plan and Precise Plans.

Restore Parkland – The Balboa Park Committee supports the general policy of restoring parkland within the Park. To accomplish this policy, the Committee supports the restoration of the Arizona Landfill site, the Inspiration Point area, development of the Balboa Park Nursery for public access and restoration of other degraded parklands. These recommendations are consistent with the goals and policies of Master Plan and Precise Plans.

Conserve Parkland – The Balboa Park Committee supports the conservation of all parkland within Balboa Park. Existing parkland should not be converted to other uses other than for park use.

Connections – Within the topic of reclaiming, restoring and conserving parkland, the Balboa Park Committee discussed the topic of connections within Balboa Park and to the surrounding neighborhoods. Balboa Park is fragmented by major roads, freeways, land use and by its own topography. The re-connection of parkland is essential to increase public access and usability of parkland. The following recommendations were made by the Committee.

- Connect the Central Mesa and East Mesa
- Connect Roosevelt Junior High and the Blind Recreation Center (better access across Park Blvd.)
- Connect downtown to the Park – Reaffirm the Park to Bay Link (John Nolen Parkway)
- Connect the Central Mesa and the West Mesa across SR 163
- Provide better sidewalks and connections at Bird Park and along Golf Course Drive (including a new golf clubhouse for golf and community use)
- Provide connections across the golf course to Switzer Canyon

With the exception of providing a connection across the golf course to Switzer Canyon, all recommendations are consistent with the goals and policies of the Master Plan and Precise Plans. The Master Plan calls for a pedestrian bridge at Marston Point to connect the Park to Eighth Avenue, and for the establishment of a pedestrian link on the Richmond Street bridge (currently closed to all traffic). The existing pedestrian bridge at Upas Street is to be maintained. The Master Plan and the East Mesa Precise Plan call for pedestrian bridges to connect the two mesas at Inspiration Point and in the vicinity of the Rose Garden.

Balboa Park Committee Workshop #2 - Promote Health of the Institutions and Other Park Elements

Cultural Institutions – The Balboa Park Committee supports the health of cultural institutions in Balboa Park. The Committee also supports growth in attendance at the cultural institutions without expansion of the building footprint. Physical growth of

institutions could occur at satellite facilities, such as the Mingei Museum satellite in Escondido. Certain areas of the park, such as Inspiration Point, could support additional buildings and institutions.

Recreational Facilities – The Balboa Park Committee feels that the recreational facilities within the Park are adequate at this point in time, but see the facilities as being inadequate as the population of San Diego grows. Some facilities need to be renovated or expanded to address additional use. Deferred maintenance is impacting the usability of recreation facilities. The Committee acknowledges that deferred maintenance is a city-wide issue and not just a Park and Recreation or Balboa Park issue. The recreation facilities within the Park have the same issues with regard to parking and access that then cultural institutions have. The Committee feels that additional neighborhood and community parks need to be built so that Balboa Park does not bear the burden of supporting the adjacent community recreation needs.

Gardens and Special Landscapes – The Balboa Park Committee feels there is a special synergy between the cultural institutions, the gardens and the special landscapes in Balboa Park. The Committee believes there is value to these gardens and landscapes. They feel that the resources allocated to address the high use of these landscapes is inadequate, but acknowledge the outstanding job that the Park and Recreation Department does with limited resources.

Balboa Park Committee Workshop #3 - Implement Parking Management and Provide Appropriate Parking

Parking Management – The Balboa Park Committee feels that parking management is a key first step in addressing parking and access issues in Balboa Park. The Committee feels that parking management will not work without implementation of an effective shuttle system to address both employee and visitors' needs.

Provide Appropriate Parking – The Balboa Park Committee supports the moving of parking spaces from the wrong places to the right places for the purpose of reclaiming parkland. The Committee also supports the relocation of these parking spaces to parking structures to maximize the amount of parkland. The Committee feels that cars are too visible in the park and need to be “tucked away” and out of sight. The Committee also feels that parking should be distributed around the park; large parking structures are not a part of the Park's character. Parking structures located at the Zoo (Park Boulevard Promenade location), at Inspiration Point and east of the Federal Building are good locations for parking structures. A parking structure at either the Alcazar Garden parking lot or the Archery Range received mixed opinions. Parking structures at Pepper Grove and south of the R.H. Fleet Science Center are not desirable.

Balboa Park Committee Workshop #4 - Implement Transit and Shuttle

Transit – SANDAG is currently working on the Transit First Showcase Project. This project will provide bus rapid transit (BRT) from downtown San Diego north on Park Boulevard and east on El Cajon Boulevard to San Diego State University. The BRT will provide for separate bus stops or stations where appropriate, and will implement various techniques to improve speed and reduce travel time along the route including dedicated bus lanes and signal priority. BRT stations are included in the transit portion of the study. Additional BRT lines are anticipated for 4th Avenue and 5th Avenue, to the west of Balboa Park. Stops would be provided at Laurel Street.

The Balboa Park Committee is in support of the BRT line through Balboa Park as the first of many needed transit improvements to serve the Park. The Committee recognizes that the BRT supplements service already provided by the #7 bus route and feels that additional service to Mission Valley, Downtown and other tourist destinations would particularly benefit the Park's visitors.

The Committee is concerned about the potential consequences of losing on street parking or a travel lane to provide a dedicated transit lane for the BRT. Their strong preference is to retain on-street parking and to avoid widening the street. The Committee asked that additional modeling be done by SANDAG to demonstrate how the BRT would operate through Balboa Park in order to inform future planning for Park Blvd.

Shuttle – The Balboa Park Committee discussed the specific information regarding the inter-park shuttle system. The Committee feels that the current shuttle system is uncomfortable, does not operate at all hours needed and does not provide adequate disabled access. They are in support of an improved shuttle system to relieve vehicular congestion in the Park. The shuttle system would go hand-in-hand with consolidated parking structures and park destinations.

The Committee expressed concern about how the proposed shuttle route would go under the Cabrillo Bridge. They suggested a site visit to review how a shuttle road would be routed in this area. The consultant team agreed that it would be very beneficial.

The Committee discussed the benefits of a two-way loop shuttle versus a one-way loop shuttle. A two-way shuttle would provide shorter trip times and would better serve employees.

The Committee discussed the cost of implementing and operating an improved shuttle system. All agreed that the benefit of an improved shuttle system is worth the allocation of resources.

Parking Management – The Committee discussed the benefits of implementing parking management within Balboa Park. The consultant team offered various techniques of parking management, including time limits, parking passes, validation and paid parking.

The Committee supported the concept of hybrid parking management, incorporating a mixture of the techniques listed above. The Committee feels that three hours is a reasonable number for time limit parking. Employees would need to be able to park for longer periods, and would require permit parking.

Committee members expressed concern about the increasing demands being placed on Balboa Park from outside influences such as the Navy Hospital, City College, the high school, and downtown commuters. They also expressed a concern that PetCo Park will be an additional demand on Balboa Park for free parking.

The Balboa Park Committee endorses the concept of Parking Management.

The Committee in general supports paid parking as a means to manage the parking, help support the improved shuttle system, and to help shift people more to transit.

Balboa Park Committee Workshop #5 - Distribute Benefits and Costs Fairly

The committee discussed potential funding sources for implementing recommendations of this Study as well as long-term maintenance and operations of facilities and shuttle systems. A variety of funding sources were identified, and the viability of each was discussed in terms of both the current economic climate as well as the potential future economic climate. Some of the potential funding sources identified by the consultant team include the following.

- Federal government (e.g. DOT, Navy)
- State government (e.g. CalTrans, Park Bond, Budget Line Item)
- City (e.g. Parks, Redevelopment Agency, Transient Occupancy Tax)
- County/Other Agencies (e.g. Park Bond, Transportation Funding)
- Residents/Taxpayers of City
- Residents/Taxpayers of County
- Residents/Taxpayers of other areas
- Users of parking (Residents/non-residents)
- Users of institutions (Residents/non-residents)
- Users of park (Residents/non-residents)
- Balboa Park Institutions
- Philanthropists
- Foundations, other granting agencies
- Other

It is likely that funding of improvements will come from a combination of the sources listed above. The discussion touched lightly on the ramifications of each of these sources. This list is not considered to be a final financing strategy for improvements, but merely a starting point for discussion. The Committee felt that all potential sources should be considered, and that none should be removed from the list until further analysis of the impacts can be done.

E. STAGE 5: FINAL DRAFT PLAN

The Final Draft Plan Stage will be the final stage of this Study. With the consent of the community and the Planning Commission, the Park and Recreation Department will seek funding to implement the next Phase of the Study.

VI SUMMARY

It is the goal of this staff report to provide the Planning Commission with additional information to address comments and concerns raised in the workshop of November 6, 2003. This report is not intended to be a comprehensive history of the Study nor is it intended to provide an analysis of the Balboa Park Master Plan and Precise Plans. A more comprehensive report, the Draft Plan Report, will be completed in the next six weeks. A copy of that report will be provided to the Commissioners when available.

Balboa Park is a valuable cultural and recreational resource for the City of San Diego residents, the San Diego region and for tourists from near and far. With increasing demands on the Park to meet community, regional and tourist needs, the Park has serious issues that must be addressed. This Study attempts to analyze the Park and current trends, and recommend solutions to meet the increasing land use, circulation and parking issues that face the Park.

Parkland is in short supply in Balboa Park as well as the surrounding communities of North Park, Golden Hill, Centre City and Uptown. The surrounding communities have always looked to Balboa Park to meet their recreational needs. This Study looks at potential areas to reclaim parkland from portions of the Park that have restricted uses, are damaged, and are paved for parking use. Through reclamation of these lands, the amount of usable parkland within the current Park boundaries can be increased.

One of the prevalent issues brought up by citizens in numerous stakeholder interviews is that Balboa Park is difficult to traverse on foot or by bicycle. The result is that even residents in the neighborhoods adjacent to the Park drive by car to the Central Mesa. There have also been numerous comments that vehicles dominate the core of the Park where pedestrians should take precedence. This Study looks at ways to connect the mesas of Balboa Park by implementing the bridge connections and surface connections recommended in the Master Plan and East Mesa Precise Plan. One additional connection is recommended in this Study to connect the Palisades area to Marston Point in an attempt to create a better connection to Centre City.

This Study also attempts to reduce the number of cars circulating throughout the Central Mesa. One possible way to accomplish this goal is to reduce the number of surface parking lots and replace those parking spaces with parking structures. This method is recommended in the Balboa Park Master Plan. By eliminating or reducing the amount of surface parking within the core of the Central Mesa, the number of cars can be reduced and the amount of parkland can be increased. Another possible method of reducing traffic within the core of the Park is to capture the cars where they enter the park and transfer the visitors to an efficient shuttle system to deliver them to their destinations. This recommendation slightly differs from the Master Plan and Central Mesa Precise Plan, but better accomplishes the goal of reducing traffic within the core of the Park.

The community has expressed concern regarding the lack of adequate parking in Balboa Park for a number of years. This parking deficiency is compounded by the absence of improved public transit as called for in the Balboa Park Master Plan. This Study, as well as recent studies and workshops conducted by the San Diego Zoological Society, confirms these deficiencies. With

increased demand for parking in the downtown area, these influences are starting to impact Balboa Park. To accomplish the goals of increasing the quantity of usable parkland and to reduce vehicular traffic within the core of the Park, the construction of parking structures is recommended by this Study. The parking structures would be located where vehicles enter the Park, and would be subterranean to minimize visual impact and increase parkland.

The goals and recommendations of the Balboa Park Master Plan, the Central Mesa Precise Plan and East Mesa Precise Plan are still valid today. This Study supports the recommendations of these policy documents, but also makes recommendations to address current needs and issues.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS NOVEMBER 6, 2003

Chairperson Lettieri

1. The study is premature for plan amendment initiation. Chairperson Lettieri appreciates us coming to the Planning Commission early.

Response: We agree that additional work is needed for this Study. The intent of the November 6th meeting was for a workshop to solicit input from the Commission.

2. We need to work with the Planning Department to look at the level of detail that is necessary.

Response: Park and Recreation staff has met with Planning Department staff, and will continue to consult with them throughout the Study. Staff will also coordinate all future staff reports, workshop sessions and presentations to the Planning Commission.

3. Plan amendment initiation gets the ball rolling. Significant issues have been raised.

Response: We agree, and are addressing those issues.

4. The shuttle is the foundation. The pedestrian environment is important.

Response: We agree, and continue to strive to improve the pedestrian environment by reducing vehicular traffic in the core of the Central Mesa and reducing the amount of surface parking to allow for additional gardens and parkland. Please see the goals and recommendations identified in Section V, C and D of this report.

5. We need community planning group recommendations.

Response: The Balboa Park Committee is the recognized planning group for Balboa Park. The Committee contains representatives from the adjacent communities' planning groups, representatives from Balboa Park organizations and members at large. Staff and the consultant team have been working closely with the Committee for the past year to gather input and formulate recommendations. It is anticipated that the Committee will take action on the Study in March or April of 2004. Their recommendations will be included in the staff report to the Planning Commission for the plan amendment initiation request.

From the beginning of the Study, community planning groups from Greater Golden Hill, Greater North Park, Uptown and Centre City have been included in stakeholder interviews and workshops as identified in Appendix G. Their input and recommendations will be sought throughout this Study as well as future phases of work.

6. The foundation of a plan amendment needs to be the park.

Response: We agree, and have been working toward improvement of the Park without damaging the health of any institution or other Park element.

7. Why do previous recommendations need to change?

Response: Many of the recommendations of the Master Plan and Precise Plans are still valid, and have been incorporated into the recommendations of this Study. There are some recommendations of previous plans that are not supported by the data found in this study, and those would need reconsideration in the proposed plan amendment. Please see the attached report for additional information. Please see the response to Commissioner Chase's question no. 11.

8. A financing plan is not required at plan amendment initiation, but it is a critical issue.

Response: We agree that financing is critical, and is necessary to implement the recommendations of this Study. The fifth workshop in a series of five workshops with the Balboa Park Committee addresses potential funding opportunities. Please see Section V, D, Balboa Park Committee Workshop #5.

9. How will the Master Plan and Precise Plan objectives be impacted?

Response: The Study has shown that the goals of the Master Plan and Precise Plans are still valid. The goals of the adopted Master Plan are identified in Section II, A, Master Plan History, of this report. The recommendations of this Study are supported by the goals of the Master Plan.

10. Assumptions of growth projections need to be included in the report.

Response: Plans for the Zoo expansion indicate an increase in attendance of 33% by year 2020. The cultural institutions were surveyed for their plans and expectations over the next 10-15 years and reported a wide range of growth potential from holding even to increasing 800% (this seems excessive). The consultant team has assumed a growth of 50% for total institutional attendance for the next decade. It is believed to be an aggressive level of growth for the institutions as a whole. For established institutions, growth would typically be consistent with regional population growth, as well as national trends in museum programming to attract audiences. According to SANDAG's 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, population will increase 38% over year 2000. Based on projections of the approved 1989 Master Plan, 8,500 parking spaces are needed to meet peak demand by the year 2000. The parking proposed by this Study does not meet the growth expectations of the cultural institutions.

11. We need equal analysis of other transportation options. We need to exhaust other means before installing structures.

Response: Three options, including an option that relies entirely on transit for growth, were included in the early phases of the Study. Please see the attached report for additional information. Since the 1989 Master Plan, which called for greater transit reliance, transit service to the Park has remained constant. The 2030 Regional Transportation Plan indicates one new transit route serving the Park, which could accommodate about 5% of visitors.

12. Environmental analysis?

Response: An environmental analysis will be prepared for any subsequent plan amendments.

13. How are adjacent Community Plans impacted?

Response: Many of the recommendations of this Study are already incorporated into the Master Plan and Precise Plans. This Study is not in conflict, and incorporates or considers current projects in the adjacent communities that are not included in the community plans. Please see the attached report for additional information.

Vice-Chairperson Schultz

1. Expressed frustration about the community claiming that they don't have enough time and not enough input. People need to seek out opportunities for input.

Response: The consultant team has made outstanding attempts to solicit community input via stakeholder interviews, workshops, public forums, newsletters, mailings, and a web site. Please see the listing of stakeholders in Appendix G.

2. Don't just throw a design at the community, then leave. The community needs to come with solutions.

Response: It is always more helpful to receive constructive criticism as well as potential solutions to issues raised. The consultant team has provided numerous opportunities for the community to review and provide comment on the status of the Study. There have been numerous stakeholder interviews, workshops and public forums at each stage of the Study to review the progress and to solicit input on the findings of the Study.

The findings of the Discovery Stage of the Study were presented to the community at a public forum on April 3, 2003. The forum attendees were grouped into tables of 8-10 people for separate workshop sessions to express their comments, concerns and goals for the Park. Each group presented the results of their workshop session at the Forum.

The results of the Findings and Options Stage of the Study were presented to the community at a public forum held on July 10, 2003. Three options, Options A, B and C, were presented to the community for input. Attendees were divided into three groups to allow better interaction with the consultant team. Each group was facilitated by Park and Recreation staff, members of the Balboa Park Committee and members of the consultant team. At the conclusion of the break-out session, the members of the Balboa Park Committee presented the results of each group to the community.

At the conclusion of the Preliminary Draft Plan Stage of the Study, the refined options were presented to the community at a third public forum on October 2, 2003. The community was given the opportunity to provide public comment on the Study, and all comments were recorded and incorporated into the Study. Forum attendees were also provided with hand-out forms that could be mailed to the consultant team for any additional comments.

The fourth public forum was held on January 15, 2004. The Draft Plan was presented to the community, with a majority of the time dedicated to public input. All attendees were allowed to speak as many times as they desired, and all questions were typed and displayed on a screen as they were presented. The consultant team answered all questions, and documented all comments and questions.

All information presented at the public forums as well as all draft reports for the Study are posted on the project web page (www.jonesandjones.com/balboapark). The web

page also provides web site visitors the ability to provide input by e-mail. Information regarding the web site has been dispersed widely throughout the community.

Please see Section III of this report for additional information on public outreach.

3. Echoes Commissioner Garcia's comments and questions of why we need parking structures. He does not want to see parking structures in the park. Too much is going into cars.

Please see the response to Commissioner Garcia's question no. 8.

4. Who are the visitors and where are they coming from?

Response: The Study has shown that approximately 31% of Park visitors come from the City of San Diego, 24% come from the San Diego metropolitan area, 21% come from California (outside of San Diego County), and 24% come from out-of-state. Of these visitors, approximately 32% are visiting the museums, 22% are visiting the gardens, 13% are walking/recreating, 11% are visiting the Zoo, 7% came to eat, 2% came to picnic and 13% came for other activities.

5. Likes the concept of pursuing affordable options such as parking management. The shuttle system should happen now.

Response: The consultant team has recommended the shuttle and parking management as the first phase of implementation.

6. Implement the shuttle system and parking management, then see what effects they have on the park. Then see what parking we need.

Response: We agree with this approach. The recommended first phase of any implementation is to provide parking management and an efficient shuttle system. More detailed analysis will need to be completed before determining if and where additional parking is needed.

7. \$300 million is a lot of money that could be better spent elsewhere.

Response: We agree that \$300 million is a lot of money. The recommendation of the Study is to phase development so that the cost can be spread out over a number of years as demand for park resources increases. The economic analysis is included in the Study to solicit input from the community to determine their priorities and what would be supported.

8. Has a concern about the use of out-of-town firms as consultants.

Response: Please see the Consultant Selection Memorandum, Appendix H, for additional information regarding consultant selection. The interview panel felt that the team of Jones and Jones/Civitas was best qualified to conduct the study.

9. Frustrated to hear that recommendations have been made before but never implemented.

Response: We agree and understand the concern. Often, a major project is necessary to act as a catalyst for design, funding and construction of plan improvements. The Park Boulevard Promenade Plan is such a project. Additionally, one of the goals of this study is to identify key elements regarding land use, circulation and parking that can be implemented early on setting the stage for subsequent improvements to be implemented.

Commissioner Brown

1. Liked looking at land use first, but then it turned to parking.

Response: A majority of the Central Mesa of Balboa Park is already developed, and there is very little opportunity for the reclamation of parkland. The primary locations for reclaiming parkland are in the locations of the surface parking lots. The goal is to reclaim these surface parking lots and relocate the lost parking spaces into structures. This necessitates the need for the discussion about parking.

2. Likes the pedestrian nature of the park.

Response: We agree, and it is one of the goals of this Study to improve upon the pedestrian nature of the Park by removing as many vehicles from the central core as possible.

3. Pull parking out of the park. Mass transit should bring people to the park, then into a shuttle system. There needs to be less traffic on Park Boulevard.

Response: We would prefer to not see cars in the Park. However, transit currently only brings approximately 5% of the visitors to the Park, with approximately 80% coming by car. MTDB projects that the use of Bus Rapid Transit will double the number of users arriving to the Park by transit.

One of the goals of this Study is to reduce traffic congestion and pedestrian/vehicle conflicts in the Park. By reducing the number of parking lots and consolidating parking into three parking structures located at Park entrances, the number of vehicles circulating through the park searching for parking should be reduced, including traffic on Park Boulevard.

4. Does not want parking to spill out into the neighborhoods.

Response: We agree that parking should not spill out into the surrounding neighborhoods. This would create traffic congestion and would eliminate needed street parking for the residents. If adequate access to the Park is not provided, the result will be Park visitors parking in the neighborhoods. This already happens on peak days and special event days.

5. If we keep building parking lots, there will never be a shift to transit.

Response: We agree with this premise. However, it is the purpose of this Study to make recommendations regarding development of Balboa Park for the immediate future and for the next 20 years. Since the adoption of the 1989 Master Plan, the recommendation of providing light rail transit on Park Boulevard from downtown to Mission Valley has yet to be implemented and there are no plans to do so. SANDAG's only plans to provide improved public transit to the Park include a BRT line on Park Boulevard, which

according to their predictions, will only increase transit use to Balboa Park from 5% to 10%. Also see the answer to Commissioner Garcia question no. 8.

6. There should be no bridge at the Rose Garden.

Response: We agree that there should not be a bridge directly at the Rose Garden. The recommendation of the East Mesa Precise Plan is to provide a bridge to the southeast of the Rose Garden to connect the Central Mesa to the East Mesa.

7. The park needs to be bike friendly. There should be more bike paths in the park.

Response: We agree, and the Study proposes strengthening the pedestrian and bicycle path network in the Park.

8. There needs to be better utilization of the West Mesa and better access across 6th Avenue.

Response: The West Mesa is heavily utilized by the community as a community park and for certain special events. The Study recommends extending a people mover (smaller shuttle system) across the Cabrillo Bridge to the West Mesa. An on-going study by the Uptown Partnership to re-configure 6th Avenue could improve pedestrian crossings across 6th Avenue to the Park as well as add approximately 200 on-street parking spaces.

9. Inspiration Point is under-utilized as a parking destination.

Response: Inspiration Point is under-utilized by Park visitors due to its remote location and current level of improvements. The improved shuttle system and parking management proposed by this Study will improve the utilization of parking in this area.

Commissioner Chase

1. Commissioner Chase expects the Commissioners comments to be addressed as well as her previous comments sent by e-mail.
2. There is not enough clarity in the plans.

Response: The graphics will be revised to better communicate the recommendations of the Study.

3. The community input received has not been included.

Response: The community input documentation is contained within three separate binders. A copy can be provided upon request.

4. There is a lack of back-up from existing plan studies.

Response: Staff did not provide all back-up material at the November workshop with the Commission. However, substantial back-up information is available in the Draft Plan and appendices.

5. Tell not only what new parking is there but also what was there and what is reclaimed.

Response: Please see Section V, B, Findings and Options Stage and Appendix F for existing parking information. Reclamation of parkland includes reclamation of the Arizona Landfill, which currently has restricted use, and reclamation of surface parking lots. Examples of existing surface parking lots that can be reclaimed for parkland include the Zoo parking lot, the Carousel parking lot, the Spanish Village parking lot and the Natural History Museum parking lot as identified in the Park Boulevard Promenade Plan. Additional parking lots to be reclaimed include the Plaza de Panama parking lot, the Alcazar Garden parking lot, the Organ Pavilion parking lot, the Palisades parking lot and the Inspiration Point parking lot. The Preliminary Draft Report will include more specific information regarding parkland reclamation.

6. How does the study conform to existing policy documents?

Response: The Study incorporates many of the recommendations of the existing policy documents. New recommendations are compatible with the goals of these documents. Please see the attached report for additional information.

7. What happens at the landfill site?

Response: The general development of the Arizona Landfill is outlined in the East Mesa Precise Plan. More detailed development of plans for the landfill site would be prepared, with community input, when funding is available.

8. What is the Capital Improvement Program for Balboa Park?

Response: The list of current CIP projects in Balboa Park includes the following:

- *Aerospace Museum ADA Upgrades*
- *Aerospace Museum Roof Replacement*
- *Balboa Park Improvements and Matching Funds*
- *Bird Park improvements (construction drawings only)*
- *California Tower Restoration*
- *Casa del Prado Façade Restoration*
- *Central Mesa Precise Plan Update*
- *Hall of Nations ADA Upgrades and Foundation Repair*
- *House of Puerto Rico Cottage (donation)*
- *House of Spain Cottage (donation)*
- *Japanese Friendship Garden Master Plan Revision (by applicant)*
- *Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study*
- *Lighting for San Diego Lawn Bowling Association*
- *Museum of Art Façade Restoration*
- *Organ Pavilion Electrical System Upgrade*
- *Palisades Building Painting*
- *Sewer Lateral Replacement*
- *Sixth Avenue Play Ground Improvements*
- *Spanish Village Maintenance Improvements*
- *Sixth Avenue Storm Drain Repair*
- *Veterans Memorial Garden*
- *West Arcade Reconstruction*
- *Golf Course Comfort Station Replacement*
- *Golf Course Clubhouse Restroom Addition*
- *Golf Course Clubhouse Master Plan*
- *Golf Course Irrigation Retrofit*
- *Golf Course Installation of Wash Racks for All Equipment*
- *Golf Course Concrete Step and Hand Railing Replacement*
- *Golf Course Fence Replacement and Repair*
- *Golf Course Road Restoration*

9. Earthday organizers have not been interviewed.

Response: A primary stakeholder interview for special events was held with Carolyn Wormser and other representatives of City agencies that coordinate special events. A second stakeholder interview has been held with other special event organizers, including Earthday organizers.

10. How much has been put into the park in past years?

Response: Balboa Park has received numerous improvements over the years. These improvements have come in the form of regular maintenance and upgrades by Park maintenance staff, upgrades and repairs done by Facilities Maintenance Department staff, capital improvements projects, infrastructure improvements by the Metropolitan Waste Water Department and Water Department, street improvements by the Transportation Department, improvements done on parkland by the US Navy, volunteer efforts, donation projects and other miscellaneous projects. It is difficult to determine the cumulative amount of funding that has been put into the Park over its 135 year history.

11. What is wrong with the existing master and precise plans?

Response: Many of the recommendations of the Master Plan and Precise Plans are still valid, and have been incorporated into the recommendations of this Study. The findings of this study have shown that the increasing vehicle volumes and vehicle pedestrian conflicts in the Central Mesa should be addressed. The existing approved plans do not have complete strategy for rectifying this problem. This study will recommend that parking be relocated to more peripheral locations that reduce the need for cars to traverse the Central Mesa. Please see the attached report for additional information.

12. Park improvements are at the end.

Response: The recommendations of the Study would provide for phasing of improvements. It is not the intent to provide parking structures only without the addition of parkland. The recommendations of the first phase of improvements, Phase I, includes the implementation of an efficient shuttle system, implementation of parking management and reclamation of the Plaza de Panama and the Pan American Plaza. This phase is accomplished without the construction of any new parking. The subsequent phases of improvements combine the reclamation of parkland concurrent with the construction of parking facilities.

13. How much is being spent on the existing shuttle system?

Response: The current annual operating budget for the park shuttle system is \$250,000.

14. Would we put \$300 million into Balboa Park only?

Response: The improvements recommended in the Balboa Park Master Plan and the Precise Plans amounts to much more than \$300 million. One of the goals of this Study is to determine a select list of improvements that will best contribute to the reclamation of parkland, improve circulation within the Park and resolve ongoing parking issues. We are seeking community input to answer the question of how much should be spent on the Park.

Commissioner Garcia

1. Many of the recommendations are the same as in past master and precise plans.

Response: We agree. The results of this Study have supported many of the recommendations of the Master Plan and Precise Plans, and have shown that a large majority of the previous recommendations are still valid. Please see the attached report. One of the goals of this Study is to identify select elements that will provide the greatest benefit to the community and facilitate their implementation.

2. There has been no means of getting plans implemented. Some items have been expected for a long time.

Response: We agree and understand the concern. Often, a major project is necessary to act as a catalyst for design, funding and construction of plan improvements. The Park Boulevard Promenade Plan is such a project. Additionally, one of the goals of this study is to identify key elements regarding land use, circulation and parking that can be implemented early on setting the stage for subsequent improvements to be implemented.

3. We need to identify what is new and what is old in the recommendations.

Response: The recommendations of this Study are identified in the attached report. The origins of the recommendations are noted with each.

4. Land Use first is good, but what are the values? What is sacred and what should not be touched?

Response: The values of Balboa Park have been discussed publicly throughout the Study. The current Master Plan and Precise Plans identify these values, and this Study has validated them through the recommendations. While the word "sacred" has multiple meanings, we agree that very large portions of the Park, and many specific places in the Park, are revered by many and should never be harmed. We are developing a map and interpretations of this idea for the purpose of reinforcing the potential for protection of these areas from any encroachment.

5. Where is land able to be reclaimed and why? The plan looks spotty.

Response: The recommendations of this Study are to reclaim damaged lands, restricted lands and selected surface parking lots. A tabulation and map of reclaimed land areas is in production at this time. This element is not included at this writing in the draft report. However, it will be in the near future.

6. We need strong policies that protect certain areas. We need a workshop just on policies.

Response: We agree that strong policies are needed to guide development of Balboa Park. The Master Plan and Precise Plans are intended to provide these policies. In

addition, this study has put forward new policy proposals regarding parkland, institutions, parking, transit and economics since the November 6, 2003 Workshop. The Balboa Park Committee has been discussing these proposals which will be a subject of our anticipated Planning Commission Workshop currently scheduled for February 19, 2004.

7. What do we value in Balboa Park?

Response: The consultant team has learned, through numerous stakeholder interviews, workshops and public forums, that the highest value is placed on parkland. The community also places value in the historical core of the Park and the cultural institutions. Many of these values are expressed in the recommendations of the Master Plan, Precise Plans and this Study. Please see the attached graphic for additional information.

8. Why meet parking demand in Balboa Park? What percentage should we meet within the park? What is the holding capacity?

Response: The data collected in this study suggests strongly that both transit and parking improvements are needed in Balboa Park to 1) increase transit ridership to the Park, 2) reclaim existing surface parking lots for park uses, and 3) carefully increase the parking supply in the Park to meet demonstrated needs. This study proposes placing an initial emphasis on parking management and internal transit shuttles to shift the focus of access within the Park onto transit and pedestrian access. It is true however, that both the institutions in the Park and general Park users depend on existing parking lots for access. This study found that the parking lots in the Park are currently at capacity on many days, with a demand for 5350 parking spaces and an existing count of 5400 spaces (excluding the Inspiration Point lot).

The 1989 Master Plan for Balboa Park emphasized reliance on transit as an important access to the Park. Today, 14 years later, the demonstrated transit ridership to the Park was found to be at 5% of all visitors (according to over 800 surveys performed on-site for this study). It is the clear opinion of the Balboa Park Cultural Partnership, which represents almost all of the cultural institutions in the Park, that the failure to achieve anticipated transit access since 1989 has had a real and growing impact on the ability of the institutions to maintain healthy levels of visitation. Some institutions, and a representative of the Activity Center, report clear and repeated incidents where the lack of transit access and the current lack of parking are a regular limitation on the use and scheduling of cultural and recreational activities.

The question of the "carrying capacity" of Balboa Park for parking and visitors is an important but elusive one. Today, with 5,400 parking spaces at capacity, and only 5% transit capture, there is a general perception by many that the Park is near capacity. The level of use within the Park by general park users, institutional users and special events is extraordinary, with visitor estimates currently at roughly 12 million people annually. This study will recommend that it is prudent to shift the focus of access onto greater

transit usage and pedestrian access; however not to the extent that visitation is limited as a result of limiting access. Further, this study will recommend that it is not prudent to increase the total supply of parking within the Central Mesa. Instead, if parking increases are ultimately warranted, this study will recommend that those increases occur as a result of a parking structure at Inspiration Point in combination with effective transit shuttles and parking management throughout the Park. This concept can provide for increases in visitation to the Central Mesa while providing real opportunities to reclaim parking lots in the Central Mesa for park purposes including the Plaza de Panama, Palisades, Alcazar lot and Organ Pavilion lot. The study is concluding at this writing that the value of these existing parking lots on the Central Mesa is greater if they can be returned to park uses instead of continuing in parking uses. Accomplishing this reclamation depends on finding the best locations for parking to be structured.

The idea of parking outside of the Park has been addressed as well. Land values and neighborhood plans preclude the development of large volumes of parking outside of the Park. However, the study supports the identification and development of improved parking access along the park edges, such as the Uptown community proposal along 6th Avenue on the west edge of the Park, which could add roughly 200 parking spaces on-street. The downtown area has developed significantly in recent years, making off-site parking development cost prohibitive and insufficient in that location.

9. Why is parking where it is?

Response: Existing parking in the Park has been located in the closest, level areas for the sake of convenience. The goal of locating parking structures where shown in this Study is to capture cars where they enter the Park. This should reduce the flow of traffic within the Park's core, provide a more pedestrian-friendly environment, and allow for reclamation of asphalt for parkland.

10. What would we expect of people walking in?

Response: Many different visitors bring varying expectations and needs for walking: neighbors, residents of the region, tourists, employees and volunteers have distinct needs on their particular trip. Accordingly, there are varying viewpoints about how far people will walk to arrive at a given destination. Also, people have different levels of mobility. Walk San Diego has stated that people will walk approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ mile to a destination while others express concern of anything greater than a few hundred yards.

Today there are many periods when the Central Mesa roadways are heavily traveled, with frequent pedestrian/vehicle conflicts. This study has attempted to reduce vehicle congestion and conflicts by re-locating parking into structures at the edges of the Prado and Inspiration Point, in combination with transit shuttles. This would allow access to be increased while also increasing parkland reclamation and while reducing vehicle penetration into the Central Mesa.

11. There is no connection from neighborhoods into the Central Mesa.

Response: The recommendations of the East Mesa Precise Plan, incorporated into the recommendations of this Study, would provide connections to the communities of Golden Hill and North Park by providing bridges over Pershing Drive and Florida Drive. The recommendation of the Master Plan to provide a bridge at 8th Street to Marston Point would provide a connection to downtown. An additional bridge recommended by this Study, from Marston Point to the Palisades area, would further strengthen the connection to downtown.

12. There are issues associated with pathways through the golf course.

Response: The Study acknowledges that there are issues with safety in providing pedestrian pathways through the golf course. The disconnection of Switzer Canyon and the neighborhoods from the Park is significant as a result of the extent of the Golf Course. This study will recommend that the issue be studied thoroughly in later work in hopes that creative solutions may eventually be found.

13. How could a shuttle serve people around the park and not just in the Central Mesa?

Response: The Study supports the goal of providing a shuttle system that loops the entire Park. However, this recommendation falls beyond the scope of this Study. This study will recommend both an internal shuttle that connects the Central Mesa and Inspiration Point together, and a people mover that will connect buses on 4th and 5th with buses on Park Boulevard. These improvements will form the foundation for eventual park-wide shuttles.

14. Plans on 8-1/2 x 11 are hard to read. Future plans should be on 11 x 17.

Response: Larger graphics will be provided in the future.

15. We should not allow any more additional Navy parking. The same goes for City College.

Response: The Balboa Park Committee is in agreement. This study is seeking ways to effectively use Inspiration Point for Park purposes first. However, it may become possible to develop parking jointly with outside entities to meet joint needs. The study has not concluded discussion on this topic at this writing.

16. There should be no more parking than we already have. Utilize transit, shared parking and special event management.

Response: The Study is intended to determine if additional parking is needed not only currently but also in the future. Please see the attached report for additional information. Under the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, only one new transit line will serve Balboa Park. While a policy of not providing more parking is possible, it

implies that little or no growth in attendance should occur. It presents major questions for the health of the Park's institutions.

Commissioner Ontai

1. Balboa Park started as a cultural event with the 1915 Panama-California Exposition. We need to recognize that the history of the Park is institutional. We need to look at what the institutional needs are.

Response: The needs of the cultural and educational institutions are being considered equally with other park users and facilities. There have been numerous stakeholder interviews and workshops with the cultural institutions and the Balboa Park Cultural Partnership.

3. People came to the park by shuttle for the exposition.

Response: Staff acknowledges the comment.

4. Cars were introduced into the Park in the 1920's, and we are still struggling with cars in the Park.

Response: Staff acknowledges the comment.

5. The automobile may not be the means of transportation in 50 years.

Response: Staff acknowledges the comment.

6. The Park started as a pedestrian park.

Response: Staff acknowledges the comment.

Commissioner Steele

1. Recognizes that San Diego is becoming a City. Decisions need to be made accordingly.

Response: The comprehensive nature of this study is designed to address this reality, and hence, the need to define and debate the fundamental questions of values and objectives within the Park.

2. Parking as a strategy to restore Balboa Park. Removing parking from the center of Balboa Park is a good idea.

Response: This is a central premise of this study.

3. There is no map of what parkland will be reclaimed. Everything else should follow that.

Response: Graphics will be revised to more accurately indicate where parkland would be reclaimed including tabulation.

4. The Park to Bay Link is a good idea. There should be more follow-up on that.

Response: This study agrees and will reinforce that recommendation. Unfortunately, the Bay to Park Link falls outside the jurisdiction of this Study. This will be coordinated with the CCDC community plan update.

5. Why not explore less parking in the park?

Response: Three options, including an option that relies entirely on transit for growth, were included in the early phases of the Study. The interviews and public meetings that have been part of this study do not support the idea of any dramatic reduction in existing numbers of parking spaces, because all users within the Park experience frequent parking shortages. There is broad support for relocating parking to reclaim parkland, provided that access to institutions remains adequate. Please see the attached report for additional information.

6. \$300 million is too expensive. We need to get more for the money.

Response: We agree that \$300 million is a considerable amount of money. The recommendation of the Study is to phase development so that the cost can be spread out over a number of years as demand for park resources increases. The economic analysis is included in the Study to solicit input from the community to determine their priorities and what would be supported. Please see the response to Commissioner Chase's comment #14 for additional information.

E-mail Correspondence from Commissioner Chase

TO: Park & Recreation Department

RE: Workshop on Balboa Park Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study

I have the following questions pertaining to the Workshop this Thursday at the Planning Commission on the Balboa Park Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study materials provided and specifically the Scope of Services EXHIBIT A pertaining to this Study and the City Manager's report for the Planning Commission Workshop on Nov. 6 REPORT No. P-03-336.

First, with respect to the Scope of Services,

1. The total amount of the contract states \$650,000. At what hourly rates is this being billed and how many hours have been used to this point? How much of the \$650,000 has been expended for what is before us at this time?

Response: The billing rates are listed in Exhibit C of the Consultant Agreement. A copy of the consultant agreement can be provided upon request. Approximately 60% of the contract had been billed at the time of the November 6th Planning Commission workshop. As of January 28, 2004, the consultants have been paid \$500,000 (approximately 77% of the contract).

2. The City's General Plan and Elements and specifically the Strategic Framework Element were not called out on the list of key documents governing the City's "professional standards of practice" pertaining to this Scope of Services, though the list does state that it's "not necessarily limited to" that list. Has this planning effort reviewed their work through the General Plan and application of the Strategic Framework Element? I also see nothing on the schedule for input from the adjoining Community Planning Groups. When will those groups have their chance to hear these issues, give input and make recommendations?

Response: The consultants have reviewed all applicable planning and policy documents for this project. Though not specifically identified, the planning groups for Centre City, Uptown, North Park and Golden Hill have all been included in stakeholder interviews and workshops for this Study.

3. On Page 3 it states "Consultant shall consult with the City to ascertain the requirements of the Project including operational needs analysis in coordination with the City's Park and Recreation Department."

What was ascertained? What has the Park & Rec Departments stated as the "requirements of the Project."?

Response: The Park and Recreation Department has provided guidance to the consultant team throughout the Study on numerous topics, including but not limited to, stakeholder lists, workshop coordination, advisory body review, operations needs and other topics.

The requirements of the project are as outlined in the Scope of Work (Exhibit A) of the Consultant Agreement.

And what specifically are the "Conceptual Design Documents"? Who has approval of those and at what point in the process?

Response: The Conceptual Design Documents include the White Papers and final report prepared for this Study. This Study will not result in an action by any specific advisory or approval body. However, endorsement for the Study is being sought from the Balboa Park Committee, the Park and Recreation Design Review Committee, the Park and Recreation Board, the Planning Commission and the Natural Resources and Culture Committee. The Planning Commission will be the only advisory body to take any action on this Study, in the form of authorization to initiate plan amendments. Historical Resources Board staff feels that HRB approval is more appropriate at the plan amendment stage.

4. Page 6 of 13 refers to "the Work Plan." Please provide this Work Plan.

Response: Please see attached Work Plan.

5. Page 7 states, "The Consultant shall conduct interviews with an approved list of stakeholders."

Please provide this list and the date it was provided to the Consultant.

Response: The stakeholder list was prepared by the consultant team, and reviewed and approved by the Park and Recreation Department. Please see the attached stakeholder list.

6. Page 7 section 3-2.4 Deliverables under 3-2.4.2 "Perform new traffic count and parking utilization needs assessment." What is status of this? Please provide complete methodology and status of data and any version of and report currently available - not just a powerpoint graphics/summary.

Response: This work has been completed, and the information is contained in the Findings and Options White Paper previously provided to the Planning Commission. Future detailed studies will need to be done prior to any implementation.

7. Page 7, "The Consultant shall continue to inventory current traffic, parking and circulation systems and assess overall operations to identify strengths, weaknesses, incompatibilities with land use of other systems and opportunities of change."

How is this being done? What methodology is being used to ensure efficient use of resources?

Response: This work is a continuation of the planning effort initiated in the Discovery stage of the Study. The consultant team is charged with completion of the Study within the negotiated fee.

8. Page 9, Section 3-3.5 Deliverables, 3-3.5.2 "Provide land use policy assessment"...

What is the status of this? What will this consist of? Will this consist of analysis against the General Plan and its applicable Elements including adjoining Community Plans?

Response: The policy documents referred to are the Balboa Park Master Plan, the Central Mesa Precise Plan, the East Mesa Precise Plan and the Inspiration Point Precise Plan. The analysis of these policy documents is included in the White Papers previously provided to the Planning Commission.

9. Page 9, "Consultant shall detail travel demands for activity scenarios using a 24-hour Trip Simulator analysis software."

What are the "activity scenarios"? What software was used and please provide the detailed report of these simulations.

This page also references the "design day." What is the project's "design day"?

Response: This information is contained in the White Papers previously provided to the Planning Commission. Additional information will be provided in the Preliminary Draft Report in late January.

Second, questions on the CM report:

1. On page of the CM report it states, "A total of seven consulting firms were interviewed for the project. The interview panel selected the consulting team of Jones and Jones Architects...."

Please provide a list of the interview panel.

What methods and rankings did they use for the firms?

Please provide the rankings for the firms.

Have the rankings used change in the last year or so when it comes to evaluating choices of firms for projects such as this?

Response: The consultant team is comprised of Jones and Jones Architects and Landscape Architects, Inc. (Seattle, WA), Civitas Inc (Denver, CO), TDA Inc. (Seattle, WA), LJ Black Consulting Group (San Diego, CA), Architect Milford Wayne Donaldson (San Diego, CA) and HR&A (New York, NY). At the conclusion of the interviews, the selection panel unanimously selected the Jones and Jones consulting team for this Study. Please see the attached memorandum to the City Manager regarding consultant selection.

2. The report lists "the Pershing maintenance yard" as "restricted land" and then later states as an objective, "returning restricted uses to public use," But the study appears completely silent about the fact that this land is dedicated parkland and this land should be reclaimed asap in order to actually enforce the City's Charter as well as meet the objectives of this planning effort. It appears to me to only be restricted by a lack of respect by the City Manager of dedicated parklands and lack of appropriate planning by the Manager and the Park and Rec Department. Please provide any additional information as to the exact "restrictions" on this area other than the need for the CM to find other locations for non-park related services. It is a severe oversight that this area appears to not be addressed in this process as it is dedicated park land and its appropriate parkland use should be part of this.

Response: The reclamation of the Pershing maintenance yard is called for in the East Mesa Precise Plan. It is not the responsibility of this Study to "enforce" the policy documents, but rather to make recommendations as described in the attached report.

3. It states that "Land Use is a key area of this study." What exactly is being studied? The key factor of land use and circulation is how circulation works around the areas adjoining and the ingress and egress impacts for those areas - including local and regional circulation capacity on freeways and local streets and roads.

Where are the comparisons and analysis of the needs of the adjoining Community Plan areas and consistency with land uses and circulation and park needs around the Park? How is this planning effort consistent with the Strategic Framework Element of the General Plan and of adjoining Community Plans?

Response: The Master Plan and subsequent Precise Plans have been prepared with consideration of the adjacent community plans, and the adjacent community plans have been prepared in consideration of the Balboa Park Master Plan. The community plans of the adjacent communities acknowledge the value of Balboa Park as a cultural and recreational resource, and recommend maintaining and improving access to the Park. This Study is compatible with these community plans. Balboa Park is identified as a Regional Park, and that use will not change.

4. Are the proposals for parking structures at Hall of Champions and Pepper Grove above ground, underground? what??

Response: The proposed parking structures would be underground, and would not be visible. Recent workshops with the Balboa Park Committee recommend deletion of the both structures from the Study.

5. How is this study maximizing integration for transit? What has been done to minimize demand for parking? What types of demand management suggestions have been pursued? This is a key policy of the SFE and it appears that this study has based all its views on providing more parking to meet whatever forecast demand you think can be justified. I am very concerned that this effort has not made any attempt to actually

implement smart growth but rather is looking to maximize parking anywhere people want to park simply based upon institutional desires for growth. That is not comprehensive or integrated land use planning. What is the basis for estimated 50% growth in attendance for other institutions as a valid planning point for establish parking demand? The Zoo has the best capacity for achieving growth, it is hard to believe that if the Zoo can only to 33% that others could attain 50% especially when growth figures are always optimistic.

Response: This Study incorporates stations for the proposed BRT on Park Boulevard per stakeholder interviews with MTDB/SANDAG representatives. Per MTDB/SANDAG projections, the BRT will only increase transit use for Park visitors by 5%. Additional BRT lines are proposed for 4th Avenue and 5th Avenue, and the Study recommends a people mover to capture those visitors at 6th Avenue and Laurel. Four existing bus routes currently serve these same routes. No additional regional transit is proposed by MTDB/SANDAG at this time. The 50% growth projection is based on estimates by Park institutions. This growth may be on the optimistic side, which is why the Study recommends phased improvements so that additional parking is provided only when needed.

6. Please provide an acreage breakdown of the estimated 45 acres of reclaimed parklands. How many acres and where the pieces are i.e. for example, the Alcazar Gardens parking lot. State the size that would be reclaimed and what is there not i.e. how many parking spaces.

Response: More detailed information will be contained in the Draft Report.

7. For the estimated \$292-343 million - for Phase 1 capital costs - please break that down by how much is for parking and how much is for other projects, i.e. reclaiming those acres, building the bridges, shuttle services, exactly what. And of the among for the parking structures, please break those out by each structure – not just area of the park. Exactly what would we get for that estimate? What additional non-capital costs would be required? What would those be?

Response: Phase 1a would include approximately \$15-25 million for parkland improvements, approximately \$1.5-2.5 million for parking improvements, and approximately \$5-15 million for implementation of an efficient shuttle system. Phase 1b would include approximately \$45-50 million for parkland improvements, and approximately \$225-250 million for parking improvements. Approximately 25-35% of the project costs would include design, administration and construction administration expenses. More detailed information regarding improvement costs will be included in the Draft Report.

8. How have you maximized efficiency of surface parking in and around the Park and surrounding areas? I have heard there is a traffic calming study looking at parking and circulation and land use issues on the west side with Uptown Planners. How have you coordinate this effort with that effort?

Response: The Study has shown that the main demand for parking is in the central core of Balboa Park. Additionally, it is not desired to use street parking needed by residents and businesses to meet the demands for the Park. The first phase of implementation recommended in the Study is the establishment of parking management, including employee and volunteer parking management, and the establishment of an efficient shuttle system. These steps will maximize utilization of the existing surface parking. This Study has been coordinated with the traffic calming study for 6th Avenue being conducted by the Uptown Partnership. These two projects are compatible. However, it is most likely that the parking gained on 6th Avenue will be needed by the increasing residential population in the Bankers Hill area. This parking is also too far away from the Prado area of the Park to be of significant benefit.

9. What are additional specifics on the proposed bridges - how long are the spans and what the destination points for them specifically? I have heard community complaints that they are bridges to no where. Are there future uses that would generate pedestrian trips?

Response: There is only one new bridge proposed by this Study that is not already a recommendation of the Master Plan or Precise Plans. The bridge from Marston Point to Downtown and the bridge from Inspiration Point to Golden Hill Park are both proposed in the Master Plan. The bridge from the Rose Garden area to the East Mesa is proposed in the East Mesa Precise Plan. It is anticipated that this bridge would be constructed in association with the reclamation of the Arizona Landfill. The bridge from Inspiration Point to Golden Hill Park is also reinforced in the East Mesa Precise Plan. The new proposed bridge would connect Marston Point to the Palisades area of the park. The specific design of this bridge will be considered at a later date. During stakeholder interviews, numerous people complained about not being able to get from one part of the park to the other because of busy roadways and because of the topography. The bridges are intended to connect the mesas of the park.

Thank you for your consideration and aid in answering these questions. Planning for Balboa Park is without question one of the most important - if not the most important - concerns for the City.

I'm hoping that the answers to the above question increase my confidence that the resources and efforts applied toward this are being properly integrated and planned and not, as I fear based upon what's being provided to date - rushed and piecemealed.

Please call me with any additional clarifying questions.

Carolyn Chase
Planning Commissioner
858-272-2930

E-mail Correspondence from Commissioner Chase

To: Park & Rec Dept

RE: Jones & Jones Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study

In addition to the written questions submitted on 11/5/02 and the additional questions asked at the hearing on 11/6/03, the following important land use considerations occurred to me overnight.

What about needs for additional public restrooms?

Since you are doing long term land use planning for growth over 20 years or more it seems to me that you will need to determine locations for new and increases if possible for existing public restroom facilities.

Please report on what exists now and what should be planned for the future and recommendations as to where - and if existing in-ground sewage capacity exists that can be tapped into.

Also, drinking fountains should be considered as well.

Response: We agree that additional public restrooms and drinking fountains will be needed for new Park facilities. This Study is not intended to look at the specific needs of the Park to this level of detail. These recommendations will be forthcoming during the plan amendment phase and subsequent capital improvement projects.

thanks,
--cdc

Planning Commissioner

